Foreign
Broadcast
Information
Service
50
ANNIVERSARY
1941 - 1991

Daily Report

Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-092
Monday
13 May 1991

Daily Report
Soviet Union

FBIS-SOV-91-092

CONTENTS

13 May 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: On 6 May 1991, the DAILY REPORT will begin phasing in new radio and television sourcelines that reflect how a station identifies itself. This change eliminates the "Domestic Service" and "Television Service" designations in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

ARMS CONTROL & DISARMAMENT

Importance of Medium Range Missile Treaty Noted *[TASS]* 1
  Last SS-20 Missile Destroyed *[TASS]* 1
NATO Reportedly Harming Soviet Interests *[Moscow Radio]* 1
UN Discusses Package of Disarmament Documents *[TASS]* 2

WORLDWIDE ISSUES

Commentary on Bessmertnykh Middle East Tour *[Moscow International]* 3
Lukyanov Meets Interparliamentary Union Leader *[TASS]* 3
  Dzasokhov, Kornijon Confer *[PRAVDA 11 May]* 3
Nuclear Weapons Test Participants' Meeting Opens *[TASS]* 3
European Stance on Soviet Emigrants Viewed *[LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 17]* 4

INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Bush Phone Conversation Reported *[PRAVDA 12 May]* 7
  Bush Cited on Conversation *[TASS]* 7
USSR-U.S. Summit Postponement Rumor Viewed *[PRAVDA 11 May]* 7
'Cooling' in Soviet-U.S. Relations Analyzed *[Moscow International]* 9
Bush Talks With Baltic Leaders Viewed *[PRAVDA 11 May]* 9
Moiseyev Arrives in Canada for 'Official Visit' *[TASS]* 10
  Signs Military Agreement *[TASS]* 10

China

PRAVDA Carries Interview With Jiang Zemin *[13 May]* 10
Titarenko on Jiang Zemin's Moscow Visit *[Moscow International]* 12
Titarenko on Sino-Soviet Economic Ties *[Moscow International]* 13
Yazov Reviews Visit to PRC *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* 13
Beijing Embassy Spokesman on Relations *[Moscow International]* 14

Northeast Asia

U.S. Nuclear Arms Withdrawal From ROK Viewed *[Moscow International]* 14
Antigovernment Demonstrations in ROK Viewed *[Moscow International]* 15

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Nguyen Van Linh Moscow Activities Reported 15
  Hanoi Radio on Visit 15
  PRAVDA Summarizes Talks *[12 May]* 16
Do Muoi Delegation Concludes Moscow Visit *[Hanoi Radio]* 16
  Moscow Issues Communique *[TASS]* 17

Do Muoi Hails Cooperation Accords *[Radio Moscow]* 17
IZVESTIYA Summarizes Visit *[12 May]* 17

Near East & South Asia

IZVESTIYA Reviews Bessmertnykh Jordan Stop *[11 May]* 18
Bessmertnykh Terms Talks With Levi 'Useful' *[TASS]* 19
TASS Roundup of Bessmertnykh Visit to Israel 19
Bessmertnykh Says Egypt Visit 'Very Timely' *[TASS]* 19
Bessmertnykh, Mubarak Discuss Regional Problems *[TASS]* 20
Bessmertnykh, Egypt's Sidqi Discuss Economic Ties *[TASS]* 20
Bessmertnykh: Mubarak To Join Talks With Baker *[TASS]* 20
TASS Reviews Joint Egyptian Talks 20
Bessmertnykh, Baker Begin 2d Round Talks in Cairo *[TASS]* 21
Egyptian Minister on Bessmertnykh-Baker Talks *[TASS]* 21
Baker's 'Shuttle Diplomacy' in Mideast Viewed *[PRAVDA 12 May]* 21
Bessmertnykh, Baker Give Briefing After Talks *[TASS]* 21
Bessmertnykh's Lebanon Visit Postponed *[Moscow International]* 22
Progress of Bessmertnykh Near East Tour Viewed *[IZVESTIYA 13 May]* 22
TASS Overview of Bessmertnykh's Mideast Visit 23

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet 12 May Session Reported *[Moscow TV]* 24
  Changes in Military Service Approved *[TASS]* 25
  Law on Chernobyl Compensation Adopted *[Moscow Radio]* 26
  Amendments to Labor Law Approved *[TASS]* 26
  Lukyanov on Gorbachev-Yeltsin Meeting *[TASS]* 26
  Dzasokhov Addresses Deputies on Exit Law *[Moscow TV]* 26

Political & Social

Gorbachev Warns U.S. Against 'New Cold War' *[London PRESS ASSOCIATION]* 27
Gorbachev Meets With Autonomous Republic Heads *[PRAVDA 13 May]* 28
  Union Treaty Discussed *[TASS]* 28
  Meeting Not 'Unusual' *[TASS]* 29
Stankevich: Gorbachev Should Remain Leader *[Vienna DIE PRESSE 10 May]* 29
TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 11 May 29
TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press 12 May 30
TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 13 May 31
More on Gorbachev Address to Young Army Men *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 May]* 32
Gorbachev Discusses Autonomy With Volga Germans *[Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG 10 May]* 33
Pavlov Interviewed on Economic Reform, Government *[Rome LA REPUBBLICA 9 May]* 34
Further Progress Made on Union Treaty Draft *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 May]* 36
All-Russian Television Debuts 13 May *[TASS]* 38
TV, Radio Agency Director Outlines Goals *[Moscow International]* 38
Media Festival Marked by 'Heated Exchange' *[Radio Rossii]* 38
Pozner Explains Departure From TV Post *[KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 7 May]* 39
Commentator Views Gorbachev's 'Centrist' Position *[Moscow International]* 41
'Top Priority' Program Views Communist Party *[Moscow International]* 42

Economic

Pavlov Expects More Freedom in Choosing Markets *[Hamburg DPA]* 43
Vorkuta Miners Suspend Strike, Resume Operations *[TASS]* 43
  Coal Extraction Resumed *[TASS]* 43
One Mine Still Not Working in Kuzbass *[Moscow Radio]* 44

Military

Yazov Approves Creation of Cossack Units *[Moscow Radio]* 44
Volkogonov Denies Plans for Russian Army *[Paris LE MONDE 9 May]* 44
Army Recruitment Problems Reported in Leningrad *[Moscow Radio]* 45
Last Warship Built at Leningrad Shipworks *[Moscow International]* 46

REGIONAL AFFAIRS

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Delegation on Delay in USSR Talks *[Radio Vilnius]* 47
Bickauskas Calls For USSR Policy Statement *[IZVESTIYA 12 May]* 47
Lithuanian Draft Constitution Published for Debate *[TASS]* 47
Lithuania's Motieka Queried on Current Issues *[Radio Vilnius]* 48
Lithuania's Vausvila Meets USSR Officials *[Radio Vilnius]* 49
Lithuanian Paper on New Economic Blockade Threats *[Vilnius International]* 50
Landsbergis Continues Visit to United States 50
    Speaks With Former U.S. Presidents *[Vilnius Radio]* 50
    Pays Visit to Chicago *[Vilnius Radio]* 51
Lithuania's Prunskiene Interviewed on Future Plans *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 51
Landsbergis' View of Situation in Lithuania *[ROSSIYA No 16]* 53

RSFSR

Yeltsin on Relations with Gorbachev, CSFR Visit *[Prague Radio]* 55
    Interview With CSFR Journalists Cited *[Radio Rossii]* 56
Yeltsin Stresses Need To 'Work Together' *[Moscow International]* 58
Ryzhkov Interviewed as Yeltsin Challenger *[KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 11 May]* 58
Soyuz Group Supports Ryzhkov Candidacy *[TASS]* 61
Lipetsk Workers Criticize Ryzhkov's 'Tractability' *[PRAVDA 9 May]* 61
Commission Chief Opposes Postponing Election *[TASS]* 61
Russian Party Leaders on Presidential Election *[TASS]* 62
Official Views RSFSR Presidential Election *[SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 May]* 62
Krasnodar Declares State of Emergency in Kuban *[TASS]* 64
Democratic Russia Plenum Postponed *[Radio Rossii]* 64
Russian KGB Reorganization Reviewed *[Moscow TV]* 64
Cossack Atamans Discuss Chechen-Ingush Violence *[IZVESTIYA 9 May]* 67
'Expropriators' of Unused Land Moved Against *[IZVESTIYA 8 May]* 67
Ivanovo City Executive Committee Resigns *[IZVESTIYA 7 May]* 67

Western Republics

Ukraine's Kravchuk on Relations With Center *[MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI No 16]* 67
Ukrainian Deputy Released From Remand *[TASS]* 70
Moldovan National Front Holds Rally in Kishenev *[Moscow TV]* 70
Moldovan First Deputy Premier on Crisis Plans *[Moscow Radio]* 70

Caucasus

Azerbaijan-Armenia Border Area Described 71
    Still 'Tense' 8-10 May *[TASS]* 71
    Area 'Relatively Quiet' *[IZVESTIYA 11 May]* 71
    'Quiet' Overnight 12 May *[Moscow Radio]* 72
NKAO Situation, Arms Confiscation Noted *[TASS]* 72
Troops Surround Another Armenian Village *[Yerevan Radio]* 72
Grenade Fired at Stepanakert Commandant's Office *[TASS]* 72
Armenian Supreme Soviet's Activities Reported 73
    Protests Army, KGB Actions *[TASS]* 73
    Deputies To Visit Region *[Yerevan Radio]* 73
    Protests Arrests *[PRAVDA 11 May]* 73

Armenia Protests 'Military Aggression' to UN *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Armenian Official Says Situation 'Relatively Calm' *[Yerevan Radio]* 74
Armenian Leader Urges Karabakh Autonomy *[Moscow Radio]* 74
Armenian Representative Assails Moscow Actions *[TASS]* 75
Mutalibov Receives Foreign Reporters *[Baku Radio]* 75

Central Asia

Kazakh TV: False Information May Be Distributed *[Alma-Ata Radio]* 76
Tajik President Moves To Create Economic Council *[Dushnabe Radio]* 76
Tajik Government Reduces Local Retail Prices *[Moscow Radio]* 76
Kyrgyz's Akayev Appeals To Curb Strike Pressure *[IZVESTIYA 12 May]* 76

Importance of Medium Range Missile Treaty Noted

LD1205105191 Moscow TASS in English 1032 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS military analyst Vladimir Chernyshev]

[Text] Moscow May 12 TASS—The scrapping of Soviet missiles, envisaged by the Soviet-American treaty on middle and shorter range missiles, will be completed at the Kapustin Yar firing range today. The destruction of American missiles, in keeping with this treaty, was completed in the United States a few days earlier. Today it is apparently time to glance back at the road traversed by the two countries and to assess the importance of this treaty and its results.

I believe very few people now doubt the treaty's political and military significance. Its political importance lies in the fact that it has marked a turning point in Soviet-American relations or, in a broader sense, in the development of international policy in general. It has actually laid the beginning for the process that finally put an end to the "cold war" epoch. There is one more very important point. We have learned a new approach to the problem of security, according to which political means should always prevail over military ways.

From the military point of view, the middle and shorter range missiles treaty contributed to the stabilisation of the military- strategic situation. It was the first step towards ending the steadfast military build-up. After all, it envisaged the destruction of highly accurate missiles, most of which take very little time to hit the target, but are rather vulnerable on their launching pads. Systems with such performance characteristics are particularly fit for the first strike. It is not without reason that NATO strategy envisaged the use of middle-range U.S. missiles for dealing the first nuclear blow. They served as a link between battlefield nuclear weapons and the strategic nuclear strike force, as rungs in the nuclear war "escalation ladder".

Hence, two rungs have now been knocked out of this "escalation ladder" and the very concept of controlled west-east war escalation has been put in question. I believe the time has come to start talks on tactical nuclear weapons in Europe.

It goes without saying that the agreement on middle and shorter range missiles was of fundamental importance for the entire development of the disarmament process. It ought to be admitted that the parties to these negotiations, which continued for six years, were confronted by very difficult problems. The fact that the talks were resultative shows that it is possible to find mutually acceptable compromises in the most difficult cases given the goodwill and true desire to achieve the set goal.

I believe it is very important that the following precedent has been created for the first time by these talks: Renunciation of the "classical" equal armaments reduction scheme by both sides. A new approach has emerged. Now the side that has more armaments will have to cut them by a larger margin. This approach has allowed both sides to fully scrap two important classes of weapons. Moreover, and this is also unusual in the practice of disarmament, they have scrapped mostly new and fully combat efficient systems, not obsolete armaments as it was frequently the case in the past. An important breakthrough was also made in controlling the treaty's observance: on-spot inspections were widely used for the first time. This makes both sides confident in the fulfillment of all the treaty provisions.

Last SS-20 Missile Destroyed

LD1205171791 Moscow TASS in English 1654 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Kapustin Yar, Volgograd Region May 12 TASS—The last Soviet RSD-10 missile, better known in the West as the SS-20, was destroyed here today.

This completed the liquidation of all missiles covered by the Soviet-American INF treaty.

The first SS-20 was also destroyed at Kapustin Yar. This was in the summer of 1988.

NATO Reportedly Harming Soviet Interests

LD1005184491 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 10 May 91

[Major General Geliy Batenin commentary]

[Text] NATO's recent decision to form a rapid deployment force of 150,000 men and to station a naval unit in the Mediterranean undermines Soviet strategic interests. Major General Geliy Batenin explains why:

The military and political expert feels NATO is to go a long way to changing its policy and strategy.

From the point of view of mutual security, the 150,000 force is undesirable to this country, but it is desirable for international security and the future. If this clash is to be removed, NATO must change into an instrument subordinated within the framework of the European process. NATO must help build a European political system of collective security. It must be first open to the East, and second work its political and their military organizations into the European process.

True, this is difficult, but it is a must. Security must be equal for all. If it is equal, the Soviet Union feels no mistrust.

General Batenin elaborates:

The results are a question of nuclear weapons. The rapid deployment force inevitably leans on NATO's nuclear doctrine. So NATO must make it clear. It will see to it that nuclear weapons should not be used without control by either a group of nations or any instrument beyond NATO's framework.

This view of NATO's probable new role in Europe—and its just a view—is rooted into the idea of stopping the military division of the world into the East and the West. Force can no longer ensure a security system. Unfortunately, NATO's new variant seems to give priority to force rather than politics.

Can this cross out the prospects for what has become a catch political refrain for the new political thinking? General Batenin does not believe this can happen. On the contrary, this will square the situation with present day reality.

True the new political thinking can be naturally proposed as a global behavior, but let's face it, there is a long way to making it global. We have not yet reached the point of solving all problems politically, said Major General Geliy Batenin.

UN Discusses Package of Disarmament Documents

LD0805155291 Moscow TASS in English 1125 GMT 8 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Yevgeniy Menkes]

[Text] New York May 8 TASS—A large package of working documents on various aspects of disarmament are being discussed in closed-door consultations by the current session of the UNO Commission on Disarmament.

The working group on a regional approach to disarmament in the context of universal security is holding heated debates, with delegations from six countries having submitted their ideas and proposals.

The delegates want to try a new approach, in view of the recent tragic events in the Gulf. Austrian diplomats stressed responsibility, shared by all countries, to promote a stable peace and security in the region. They noted the possibility of reaching accords on a peace settlement and proposed that the verification of any information, supplied within the framework of regional information exchange forms, be guaranteed.

The Pakistani package of ideas includes regional agreements prohibiting nuclear tests and establishing nuclear-free zones, joint statements by regional states not to acquire or produce nuclear weapons and agreements promissing non-aggression against each other's nuclear structures.

Pakistan also proposed that iimitations or ultimate levels be introduced on deploying conventional armed forces, direct commmunication lines between heads of state be set up and regular meetings between military leaders in the region be regularly held.

The package of regional measures should include limiting all kinds of armaments and disarmament, stresses the working document tabled by the Soviet Union. The regional approach seeks to achieve the lowest possible level of armaments without encroaching on anyone's security. Participants in the process should undertake multilateral political, military, economic and other obligations.

The Soviet delegation proposed discussing an approximate of a structure for regional security. Such a structure could limit military potentials to certain levels, renounce the development, production, acquisition and deployment of all types of weapons of mass destruction, restrict deliveries to other regions and the acquisition of conventional armaments, elaborate a system of confidence building measures and establish regional centres to lessen the danger of war and to prevent conflicts.

Limiting armamemnts and disarming at the regional level should be accompanied by control measures. The United Nations should provide this control. Permanent Security Council members could serve as guarantors of regional agreements, the document says.

Commentary on Bessmertnykh Middle East Tour

LD1205014891 Moscow World Service in English 2110 GMT 11 May 91

[Leonid Rassadin commentary]

[Text] The Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, touring the Middle East, has had a series of talks with Egyptian leaders in Cairo. Before then he visited Syria, Jordan, and Israel. In the Egyptian capital he is also to meet the American secretary of state, James Baker, who has left for his fourth Mideastern tour in two months. The next leg of the visit of the Soviet foreign minister is Saudi Arabia. Leonid Rassadin makes these comments.

All the talks conducted by Aleksandr Bessmertnykh center around a Mideastern settlement. The Soviet Union and the United States are ready to become joint organizers of a peaceful conference for the Middle East. Its idea is now being actively discussed. All the practical aspects of the possible conference were discussed during the Soviet-Egyptian talks. According to the Soviet foreign minister, the coincidence of views was very broad and reassuring. He expressed careful optimism about the prospects of such a forum. He said there are still many difficulties. The participation of Palestinian representatives was described as one of the problems. The Palestinians, he stressed, should decide this question themselves first.

Several other problems can also be named. For example, Israel is opposed to the participation of the United Nations in a Mideastern conference, to say nothing of the PLO. Syria demands the implementation of all UN resolutions by Israel providing for the withdrawal of Israeli troops from the occupied Arab territories. Contrary to the Arab protests, the construction of Jewish settlements continues on the West Bank of the Jordan and in the Gaza Strip. In a word, it's not so simple to untie the Mideastern knot. Much effort will be required, and especially joint ones on the part of the Soviet Union and the United States.

It's expected that during the Cairo talks of Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and James Baker, attended by the Egyptian President Husni Mubarak, the two diplomats will get the unique chance of comparing viewpoints and thoroughly discussing questions related to the possible convocation of a peaceful conference. We, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh said in the Egyptian capital, are going through an important stage when a good chance has appeared for beginning a Mideastern peace process. It's important not to lose this chance and do everything possible to carry it out into life.

Lukyanov Meets Interparliamentary Union Leader

LD0805185191 Moscow TASS in English 1336 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 8 TASS—USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoly Lukyanov received Interparliamentary Union General Secretary P. Kornijon, in the Kremlin today. Kornijon is visiting the Soviet Union at the invitation of a Soviet parliamentary group.

The two parliamentarians had a friendly talk. The guest was briefed on the USSR Supreme Soviet's legislative and international activities. Further cooperation between Soviet people's deputies and the Interparliamentary Union which affiliates parliamentarians from 113 countries, were also discussed.

Parliamentarians' joint efforts help renew international relations more dynamically and assert the priority of human values in the foreign policy of states, agreed chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet's Council of the Union Ivan Laptev and Kornijon.

The guest learned about topical political and economic problems in the Soviet Union in light of the joint statement recently signed by the Soviet president and leaders of nine Soviet republics.

It was noted that Soviet parliamentarians' relations with the Interparliamentary Union have recently been stepped up. There are good opportunities for their further development, primarily in trying to prohibit the production and proliferation of chemical weapons and save the world's ecology.

Dzasokhov, Kornijon Confer

PM1205132591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 91 First Edition p 5

[Unattributed report under general heading "Official Reports"]

[Text] On the same day [8 May] P. Kornijon [general secretary of the Interparliamentary Union] met with A.S. Dzasokhov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet International Affairs Committee. The interlocutors exchanged views about ways of resolving the most important issues of international politics, including the problem of the Mediterranean Sea.

Nuclear Weapons Test Participants' Meeting Opens

LD1005214991 Moscow TASS in English 2135 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Anna Sherbakova]

[Text] Leningrad May 10 TASS—Former officers and men who participated in nuclear weapon tests in the 50s and 60s and who formed a committee of veterans of nuclear component units held a conference in Leningrad today.

Many of former servicemen who participated in the manufacture and testing of nuclear and hydrogen weapons are now seriously ill. They suffer from disturbances of hearing and sight, malignant tumours, leukosis, diseases of limbs and joints. Medical experts of the committee believe that these diseases are not related to age. But official medics are reluctant to recognise this fact.

Most veterans believe that the pensionable age should be lowered and demand additional measures for social protection.

The veterans committee which unites more than 700 people residing in various regions was set up in Leningrad just a year ago. Earlier they could not even speak of their situation. The matter is that the officers and men pledged themselves not to speak of tests for 30 years. The committee has recently been registered as an all-union organisation.

"Our purpose is to create conditions for calm and comfortable life for people who sacrificed their health to strengthen the country's military potential," said Vladimir Bentsianov, the committee's organiser and chairman. "The committee demands a government decree which would give its members the same priviliges as have participants in military operations. It is planned to set up a medical centre and to get in touch with similar associations in the United States, Britain and Australia, and to form an international centre of participants in nuclear tests.

European Stance on Soviet Emigrants Viewed

91UF0705B Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA in Russian No 17, 1 May 91 p 4

[Article by LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondent Mikhail Ozerov: "Is Europe Awaiting Our Emigrants?"]

[Text] London—**This question is frequently asked, both in our country and in the West. And it is answered in different ways. Quite different.**

Certain Moscow publications are publishing twin articles, and the headlines are the same as well: "A New Soviet Threat," "Beware, the Russians Are Coming!"

"Their" newspapers have a calmer, more balanced tone. The West German FRANKFURTER ALLGEMEINE even thinks: "We could use some Russian emigrants."

During the past year about a million people have left Eastern Europe for the West. Among them are more than 200,000 Romanians and tens of thousands of Bulgarians, Hungarians, Poles, and Albanians. And according to data of the Council of Europe, from 1 to...30 million people are now prepared to cross the borders. As we can see, the "scissors" are very large. The London GUARDIAN does not think the number of emigrants will exceed several million. "The ruling circles in the USSR are deliberately trying to spread panic among Western officials and therefore are predicting a mass exodus of their people," the newspaper assures us.

And what about Europe? Is it finally frightened?

Doctors and Patients

A businesslike approach prevails in the Old World. Experts are consulting, making statements in the press, and developing a program for updating and harmonizing the immigration policy.

Certain countries (mainly Germany) are in favor of having the immigration contribute to general European integration. They are in favor of a uniform visa policy. And they are in favor of having all the West European countries bear a share of the financial burden. Bonn is suggesting that they all pay for the arrival of the new citizens together and without discrimination.

The British have different ideas. Their laws are among the most stringent in Europe. The Office of Employment will grant a work permit to an immigrant only if he can prove that a specific vacancy cannot be filled by anyone else in the Community. This is actually an unrealistic task! Like the one faced by the person who intends to start a business on the banks of the Thames. He must have no less than 200,000 pounds sterling as capital! But that is not all. He must prove that Great Britain needs his business, that it will create additional jobs, and so forth.

But what about the unified platform of the EEC which Bonn is advising? The representative of the British Home Office told me that "this is a matter of the distant future." They say that each government must control immigration independently, and the British intend to provide freedom of travel only to citizens of the Common Market.

The reasons for the differences are obvious. It is not just that Bonn is trying to accelerate European integration in all areas, but that London is in no hurry to follow this path. Germany and also Austria are "frontline" states. During the past year 400,000 Germans from the USSR, Romania, and Poland and 200,000 people asking for political asylum have arrived on the banks of the Rhine. And what about the 4,000 Soviet Jews? And this is to say nothing about the heaviest burden, which comes from the influx of East Germans. Last year England admitted only 25,000 emigrants (the majority from Asia and Africa, and just a few from Eastern Europe) and the officials sounded the alarm, since the army of the unemployed on the British Isles has already grown beyond the 2 million mark.

There is a lack of unity in Europe regarding one other issue as well.

"Our primary goal now is to define the status of the refugee," we are told by an expert from the UN Commission on Refugee Affairs, Klaus Feldmann. "In the USSR, as a result of ethnic and national conflicts, there are already more than 600,000 internal refugees. Previously, it was enough to flee from any country in the Warsaw Pact to obtain the status of a refugee as a victim of communist persecution, according to the Geneva Convention of 1951. Now there are no political refugees in Europe (true, one cannot rule out the possibility that they might appear again in the Soviet Union). The reasons for emigration now are most frequently economic ones—people are being rescued not from tyranny but from poverty, hunger, and a low standard of living. Yet, although we are supposed to be building a common home, the visa requirements for East European citizens are certainly not being eased. A paradoxical situation! We must immediately determine the new status of the refugee and open the doors to these people."

"And what if this takes not doors but wide gates?"

"The West, of course, is not able to receive the entire world, but we must share our material well-being. I would compare East Europeans with a patient, and the West, with the doctor. You can imagine the picture: The patient asks the doctor for help and he turns away and says through his teeth: 'There is nothing I can do for you...' We must not forget to be realistic or to think about our own interests either."

Mr. Feldmann did not explain what he had in mind, but the other people with whom I spoke said approximately the same thing. It turned out that they were not so frightened by the "invasion from the East." The German diplomat said that the "relaxation of control on immigration would make it possible for residents of Europe to breathe more freely," and he expressed the hope that Germany would become an "example worthy of imitation by EEC countries."

The Frenchman Jacques Evion sees through his own prism—business. The more so since he has hopes of extensive contacts with us. The large brokerage house he runs is participating in the construction of a hotel in Moscow and the extraction of oil in Tyumen, it is opening up several stores, and it is equipping a passenger ship.

"Liberalization of laws governing departure from the USSR is advantageous to us," Jacques is convinced. "One of the major problems of our Soviet partners is that for many decades they have not had the opportunity either to visit abroad or to obtain necessary information at home."

Monsieur Evion also said that in the West, as a result of the drop in the birth rate during the sixties through the eighties, the deficit of the work force will be aggravated. It should reach its peak by the end of the century, but one should start talking about this right away.

But here is the GUARDIAN's opinion: "Immigration from Eastern Europe to the West could present a terrible threat to European stability in the next decades or it could be a great boon to Europe's stalled economy. The result will depend on how Europe greets the millions of its new citizens." The newspaper predicts that the next "great resettlement of peoples," like those that led to the fall of Rome and the rise of America, could entail very great difficulties but it must be met "not warily but rationally and magnanimously."

Of course, the Western emigration "sieve" will sift through our compatriots, getting rid of those who are uneducated, unskilled, or who have a criminal past. Everyone intending to leave should take this into account, for a person is always able to improve his "lot in life."

But it is even more important to improve another "lot"—to change our country's approach to travel abroad.

According to the Laws of Civilized States

I have heard so many stories about our poor unfortunates in the Soviet consulate in London! One is in the hospital with burns and has already spent 5,000 pounds on his treatment. Another is washing glasses in a pub but the British could throw him in jail at any moment—he was granted the right to enter but not the right to work. A third was in the consulate with all of his belongings and announced: I will not leave here until you send me home!

Not one of them has a penny to his name. Like all the rest who call the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA correspondents' office and implore:

"I read your name in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. I do not know anyone here. Help me!"

How do our compatriots end up in England? The scenario is always the same. They pay good money for an invitation, which goes through dozens of hands and, when they receive their documents, they set out. And the "inviter" knows nothing about his guests.

The people I speak with in London are perplexed: Why is the Soviet Union still not dealing with travel abroad in a civilized way!? And it is not simply a matter of opening up additional banks for exchanging hard currency or an office for selling airline tickets. It is necessary to transform the random migration flow into an organized process. Doing this will probably take a special emigration service which would take a person from the threshold of one house to the threshold of the other. That is, it would give him information about the country and then fill out the foreign visa and the travel documents. It would find its client a job abroad and provide him with legal, social, and medical assistance. For day-to- day problems frequently become the heaviest burden for the foreigner, especially at first. The more so if he has arrived with his family. Where is he to live? Where does he get medical aid? And what about the language? Without knowing the language you cannot even get a job as a grounds keeper in England.

Who will relieve us of this entire complex of problems? Perhaps it will be the OVIR [Department of Visas and Registration]—but in principally different form. Or perhaps it will be an entire system of organizations. There is probably some merit in studying the experience of Turkey, Yugoslavia, and other countries which send their work force to the world market, and to the great advantage of their state coffers.

But we cannot cope with it alone. Actions must be coordinated on an international level.

I just shrugged my shoulders when I was asked: Will the USSR soon enter the International Migration Organization [MOM]? The purpose of MOM is to regulate migration processes on the planet. MOM is expanding the network of its branches and starting more and more new courses for future new settlers, and it is finding specialists for work in other countries. And it is as though we do not even notice...

The Soviet Union does not participate in many international agreements on migration either.

Why? Certain British think that Moscow does not want to take on the reciprocal commitments with respect to foreign immigrants to the USSR. And some people put it more bluntly.

"In the Soviet Union, at the highest level, they declare their new approaches to human rights and exchange among people. At the same time the USSR Supreme Soviet has not yet given its approval to this most important law, which would actually demonstrate the changes in Soviet life—on entry and exit. At a human rights conference in Austria I even heard this anecdote: 'Why does the Soviet Union not adopt a law on immigration? It does not have the paper to print this document'"—John Hotchkins smiles sadly. He is an eminent British sovietologist, professor, and author of books about the USSR, and he cannot remain indifferent to what is happening in our country.

"I get the impression," the professor continues, "that your functionaries would like to place another Berlin Wall on the border. They would clearly prefer not to change anything in the migration policy. I consider this a serious violation of democracy and also of the promises the Soviet leaders made to the people six years ago.

"In my opinion, they are afraid of such a law. But there is no reason for fear.

"No, the state stands only to gain from arranging for normal exchange among people and for their departure and return. Of course, certain expenses and complications will arise, but the pluses undoubtedly outweigh the minuses. Your specialists would be able to increase their qualifications, become familiar with the latest technology, and acquire business skills. Currency revenues would increase since Soviet citizens would send some of their earnings home. But the main thing is that without this law the USSR will never enter the world community and will not take its place among the civilized states."

We also discussed the fact that the long-awaited law is by no means a magic wand. It will bring real freedom of movement only under the condition that the necessary economic and currency preparation is carried out inside the USSR.

John Hotchkins is convinced that one of the basic human rights is to work and live where one wishes. Therefore, there can be no dilemma as to whether to let the citizens go or not. And even if certain Western governments impose limits on the number of immigrants, granting Soviet citizens freedom of choice will still be a great step forward. A wooden fence is not the same as an iron curtain. How people will feel once they are on the other side of it is another matter. But here a great deal depends on them personally and the attitude of their own country (i.e. ours) toward them.

United States & Canada

Gorbachev, Bush Phone Conversation Reported

CM1205190991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 91 Second Edition pp 1,5

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Conversation with G. Bush"]

[Text] The presidents of the USSR and the United States renewed 11 May their contacts by telephone. They had a lengthy conversation about the most topical points on the USSR-U.S. agenda. The significance of it lies, above all, in the fact that it confirmed their mutual commitment to a policy of improved USSR-U.S. relations, which has already contributed much that is positive to the world process and to solving major international problems. The constancy of these relations is of decisive significance for building a new and peaceful world order. Mikhail Gorbachev declared that, given this reciprocity, his choice in this respect is just as immutable as the commitment to fundamental democratic transformation of the Soviet state.

Regarding the issue of a conventional arms treaty, the presidents expressed their hope that the visit of a senior Soviet representative to Washington in a few days will allow an acceptable solution to be found. The remaining issues concerning strategic offensive weapons will present no difficulty. This, together with major problems of power engineering, ecology, housing construction, and agricultural production, will fill the USSR-U.S. summit in Moscow with a wide-ranging content.

Mikhail Gorbachev briefed George Bush on the final stage of work on the anticrisis program and stressed that it can only be correctly appraised, just as with some economic measures the Soviet Government is forced to implement at the moment, by considering specific realities in our country at the crucial stage of perestroyka.

He welcomed the proposal by George Bush in the letter he just received to send a high level delegation to the USSR next week to help clarify the situation about cooperation in questions of food.

The subject of the forthcoming meeting of the leaders of the economically most powerful states—the so-called "Group of Seven"—and their possible positions on the Soviet Union and on drawing it into the activity of the international financial organizations and on its contacts with the "Seven" themselves was mentioned. Several ideas on this subject will be considered.

A Near East settlement was also discussed. The USSR and U.S. foreign ministers are working actively at this, and it may be hoped that positive results will come from their efforts together with other states, inasmuch as the spirit of cooperation which was so manifest during the crisis and the war in the Persian Gulf is still present.

The conversation was imbued throughout with an awareness of their positions as public figures bearing enormous responsibility and enormous obligations as the leaders of two such states in the present situation. The presidents wished one another good fortune and health. I am very pleased, Mikhail Gorbachev said in farewell, that George Bush is in fine working form.

They agreed to keep one another abreast of events and maintain regular contacts.

Bush Cited on Conversation

LD1205214991 Moscow TASS in English 2138 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Ivan Lebedev]

[Text] Washington May 13 TASS—President George Bush praised results of his phone conversation with President Mikhail Gorbachev on Saturday.

He said he has a very long talk with Gorbachev, nearly 45 minutes, but it was a good conversation which helped overcome some differences. President Bush was responding to questions from journalists after his appearance at Hampton University, Virginia. He said the two presidents had discussed the Middle East situation and many other problems.

Earlier, a White House spokesman commenting on the results of the telephone conversation between the leaders of the two states noted that they had had a positive discussion of a wide range of problems of Soviet-U.S. relations. Both presidents arrived at a conclusion that the state of relations between the Soviet Union and the United States remained good.

USSR-U.S. Summit Postponement Rumor Viewed

PM1105190591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 91 Second Edition p 6

[Political observer Gennadiy Vasilyev commentary under the "View from Moscow" rubric: "The Main Current and the Eddies"]

[Text] "Wanting at all costs to hold a meeting of the superpower leaders which would enhance the prestige of the Soviet Union, the Kremlin is trying to persuade the White House to agree to a meeting in Moscow in the near future, but President Bush has issued instructions to stop all 'idle talk' about a summit. Here is the latest example: Despite the fact that the Soviet Union has responded with agreement to most of the questions raised in connection with the Treaty on Conventional Forces in Europe, the White House has reduced the chances that it will agree to Moscow's request for holding a summit on arms control issues in June."

I have cited this long quotation from THE WASHINGTON TIMES not because I agree with the opinion of the observer of this right-wing newspaper who believes that the Soviet Union desperately needs a summit in order to somehow compensate for the dire state of our economy and our other troubles and disorders. Quite the reverse. I can say on the basis of my personal observations that the seeming ease with which we achieve successes in foreign policy, seen against the growing difficulties at home, the spectacle of colorful ceremonies and festive speeches followed by pictures of empty stores and endless waiting lines in television broadcasts, only serve to evoke irritation rather than satisfaction among many of our people. I have decided to cite the quotation from the Washington newspaper merely so that readers themselves can judge what a section of the U.S. political establishment is thinking, a section, unfortunately, which is of late exerting an increasingly noticeable influence on the formation of the country's foreign policy.

In recent years we have somehow gotten used to the progress in Soviet-U.S. relations assuming the nature of a relatively smooth movement which is gathering momentum. Geneva, Reykjavik, Washington, Moscow, Washington again, Malta, United States, Helsinki... These are the main territorial and temporal milestones of the forward movement. Along this road important accords have been achieved in arms limitation, expansion of bilateral ties, and constructive collaboration in the settlement of regional conflicts, in short in the radical restructuring of international relations on principles which are referred to as the ideas of the new political thinking.

This process is continuing. The last U.S. Pershing-2 missile has just been scrapped at the Long Horn military base in Texas. In a few days' time the last Soviet intermediate-range RSD-10 [SS-20] missile will be eliminated in our country at Kapustinyy Yar. So, without any special fanfares or speeches the implementation of the main provisions of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles is drawing to a close, of an agreement which three and a half years ago was welcomed all over the world as mankind's "breakthrough" in its advance toward a nuclear-free world. And here is a matter of a different order but pointing in the same direction. Real prospects have appeared for ending a drawn-out armed conflict in a part of Africa. Accords between delegations of the government of the People's Republic of Angola and the UNITA [National Union for the Total Independence of Angola] Angolan opposition organization have been achieved with Portugal's mediation and the collaboration of the USSR and the United States. This is already an example from the sphere of our two countries' cooperation in extinguishing regional flashpoints.

I simply must also mention the recent meeting between USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker. At their rendezvous in Kislovodsk, which marked an important stage in the development of the Soviet-U.S. dialogue, the participants, "discovered a considerable expansion of the zone of coincidence of views in respect of the convocation of a world conference on the Near East"—as it was put in diplomatic language.

Yes, progress along the path which began in 1985 in Geneva is continuing. And the picture of international life would be incomplete and distorted if we ignored this. However, there are also other features. Features which, frankly speaking, are alarming. They are evidence of the obstacles which have begun to arise of late in the path of Soviet-U.S. cooperation, like bolders under the water which are causing "eddies" even on the surface of the main current. The most obvious manifestation of these obstacles is the postponement of the next Soviet-U.S. summit which is to be held in Moscow. It was scheduled for February of this year, but was then postponed to the end of the first half of the year. Now there is again talk of a possible postponement.

Naturally, as far as the summit is concerned, we can wait if necessary. Contrary to what the author of the article in THE WASHINGTON POST thinks, we have no speculative interest in the meeting. Objectively, as I see it, the interest should be mutual. But what is the explanation for the postponement? Officially, the reason given is that certain controversial questions pertaining to the upcoming agreement on the limitation of strategic offensive weapons have not yet been settled. And this is in turn linked with differences which have arisen in the interpretation of the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces in Europe which was signed in Paris in November of last year.

I will not go into the details of this matter. PRAVDA has reported on them in depth. I will only say that the differences which have arisen in connection with the disarmament agreements are not insurmountable. Especially since the U.S. newspapers themselves have reported that as a result of the exchange of letters between the two countries' presidents, the differences on the Treaty on Conventional Armed Forces have diminished, and that the draft of the SOW [strategic offensive weapons] treaty could be finalized in a very short time.

In my opinion the boulders which are causing the "eddies" in the flow of Soviet-U.S. cooperation are located deeper. The differences pertaining to the treaties are more like a symptom, rather than the cause of the difficulties which have arisen. It seems that what is at the root of it all is that Washington has embarked on making certain adjustments to U.S. policy in respect of the Soviet Union, as it were. The U.S. Administration is reacting in its own way to the crisis phenomena in our country—the economic slump, the political discord, and the sharp exacerbation of interethnic relations. There is no complete consensus in the ranks of the administration as to what course should be steered. But some of the features of Washington's "new" policy are becoming discernible. First, it is the view that there is no need to hurry with concluding Soviet-U.S. agreements. It is said that they will not run away. Let's wait and see. Second, it is the conduct of a "dual policy" in respect of the Soviet Union, as the U.S. NEWSWEEK magazine put it, that is dealing not just with the center but also with our country's individual republics.

I believe that both the former and the latter is being done on the initiative of the champions of a hardline course, those who are declaring after the easy victory over Iraq that henceforth there is only one superpower in the world, that the United States can do in the world as it sees fit.

I do not wish to assume the pose of a preacher and talk about the truly crucial importance of Soviet-U.S. relations today. I only want to note that if the trends which have appeared in Washington's policy become established, it could mean substantial losses for both countries and the world as a whole. The mutual relations between two great powers which have achieved a historical breakthrough in switching from military-political confrontation to collaboration and cooperation are a delicate matter which demands careful handling. Destroying something is always easier than creating it. We must not allow something that has been won at the cost of tremendous efforts over the past five and a half years to be thrown out of the window. Letting things slide is fraught with the danger of the revival of a "cold" or "semi-cold" war.

'Cooling' in Soviet-U.S. Relations Analyzed

LD1205123791 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0000 GMT 12 May 91

[Valentin Zorin commentary; from the "Moscow Viewpoint" program]

[Text] When President Gorbachev was meeting with Rupert Murdoch recently, he mentioned with what seemed to me disappointment some changes in Washington's policy towards the Soviet Union. Since I try to keep abreast of Soviet-American relations, I too can feel lack of enthusiasm about what officials in Washington have to say about Moscow, especially if (?we) recall the same officials discussing the same thing one year ago.

President George Bush's visit to Moscow has been again postponed indefinitely. At first it was put off until June. Judging by the lame excuses coming from Washington, the administration must have some reasons in mind to delay another summit. Or take the treaty for conventional weapons in Europe. There have been so many reports about the last few differences ironed out, but the American side keeps raising one technical obstacle after another so as not to send this treaty to the Senate to be ratified. Again the reasons seem far-fetched.

For the first time in years the Soviet Union has found American grain sales a problem. However, both representatives of farmers' organizations and some congressmen believe America would stand to gain if it sells grain to this country on credit. I could elaborate on Washington's (?corrections) of this kind but I will not. I hope the few examples I have given you spell out the regret that was expressed in Moscow about American policy zigzags, writes Valentin Zorin.

What is there behind Washington's wish to correct its policy towards this country? One of the causes that I can think of is the U.S. attitude towards the political difficulties in this country. Many observers and political scientists in America have been expressing doubt regarding stability in the Soviet Union and making speculations about its president. Doesn't this controversy in the press reveal the train of thought in the White House's political headquartes? And isn't it too early to dramatize the situation or believe that it no longer makes sense to deal with President Gorbachev? I don't think the United States can build its policy on (?guess) or gossip. According to WASHINGTON POST, President Bush himself believes President Gorbachev has retained his firm position and it would be good to hold the summit shortly. Time will tell what choice Washington will make. To my mind, Soviet-U.S. relations are too important and too fragile to be exposed to (?fleeting) political interests.

Bush Talks With Baltic Leaders Viewed

PM1105185391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 91 First Edition p 5

[V. Gan report: "The President's 'Cold Shoulder'"]

[Text] Washington—Contrary to expectations U.S. President Bush has given the leaders of the three Baltic Republics a "cold shoulder," as they say in America.

Receiving V. Landsbergis, chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, E. Savisaar, chairman of the Estonian Government, and I. Godmanis, chairman of the Latvian Council of Ministers, in the White House on Wednesday, the President made no mention of any intention of taking their side in the confrontation with the central Soviet Government. On the contrary, Bush emphasized in every way his respect for M.S. Gorbachev, and spoke of "unwillingness to cause an upset in relations which are very strong and which have already done excellent service."

The President declared bluntly that he does not intend to intervene in the process of negotiations between the Baltic Republics and Moscow. He, naturally, repeated the familiar U.S. stance according to which the United States has never recognized, and still does not recognize, the inclusion of the Baltic Republics as part of the Soviet Union. But that was all. Bush did not go any further, thus evoking his interlocutors' obvious disappointment. What is more, he called on them to seek ways of settling the dispute with Moscow which would not undermine Gorbachev's position. Judging by the reactions of the participants in the political "forced march" to Washington, they had expected more. Apart from the demagogical embraces bestowed on them by members of the Congressional Commission for Security and Cooperation in Europe, nothing else of any significance happened. The assault tactics had failed.

Frankly speaking, it was possible to work out in advance what the tenor of this meeting would be from Bush's utterances at a news conference held the day before where the President said: "Taking a look at Mikhail Gorbachev's achievements, it is easy to see that they are tremendous. It is true that the Soviet Union is living through difficult economic times. However, I have no intention of forgetting history. And everything that he has done in respect of Eastern Europe, and everything that he has done in the sphere perestroyka and glasnost evokes my respect."

Here on the Potomac, despite all the pressure which is being exerted by opportunistically-minded forces, the importance of preserving relations with the Soviet center which alone is capable of assuring a forward movement in the collaboration between our two countries is being realized. It is being realized that, ultimately, it is not intervention in the conflict between the Baltic Republics and Moscow, but normal dialogue between the White House and the Kremlin, a dialogue based on mutual respect, can provide the "anchor" to secure the new world order, an order of respect for universal human values and global security and stability. It was hardly an accident when Bush, sensing the finer points of the current political alignment replied to Landsbergis's request that the Baltic Republics be granted autonomous participation in the CSCE process that "he would like to discuss this question with President Gorbachev."

Moiseyev Arrives in Canada for 'Official Visit'

LD1005190291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1825 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets]

[Text] Ottawa, 10 May (TASS)—General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, arrived in Canada on an official visit today. This is the first visit here by such a high- ranking Soviet military chief. At the airport of the Uplands military base near Ottawa, the guest was met by General John de Chastelain, Canadian Chief Of Defense Staff, and other officials. There was an honor guard.

Signs Military Agreement

LD1105123791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1124 GMT 11 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Valentin Vasilets]

[Text] Ottawa, 11 May—An agreement on averting dangerous military activity was signed between the Soviet Union and Canada yesterday, an agreement that both sides describe as an important new page in the expansion of Soviet-Canadian cooperation. The main aim of the agreement is to create a mechanism that will make it possible to avert damage being done to the other side and to resolve through peaceful means incidents that may arise between the armed forces of the two countries on land, in the air, and at sea.

The agreement was signed by Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the General Staff of the USSR Armed Forces and USSR first deputy minister of defense, who is on an official visit to Ottawa, and General John de Chastelain, Canada's chief of national defense staff.

Speaking after a formal ceremony held in the parliament building, the Soviet military commander noted that this new step has been made possible by the development of political dialogue between the leaders of the two countries and the establishment of stable contacts in the military sphere.

On the same day Army General Moiseyev laid a wreath at a war memorial, paying a military tribute to the Canadian soldiers who died in the two world wars.

The Soviet Military commander also had a talk with Canadian National Defense Minister Marcel Masse.

China

PRAVDA Carries Interview With Jiang Zemin

PM1205183591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 First Edition p 7

[Interview in Beijing with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, by PRAVDA special correspondent V. Ovchinnikov and TASS correspondent G. Arslanov: "In the Interests of Cooperation and Peace"; date not given]

[Text] Beijing, 12 May—On the eve of his official visit to the Soviet Union Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, received Soviet journalists in Beijing.

He made a high assessment of the importance of meetings between the top leaders of our neighboring socialist states, expressed the hope that his forthcoming visit to the USSR would promote the further strengthening of the traditional friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, talked about the progress of reform in China, and stressed the importance of Sino-Soviet friendship as an important factor for stability in the Asia-Pacific region and worldwide.

The conversation began with questions of a personal nature. We asked Comrade Jiang Zemin to reminisce about his younger days and to talk about which historical figures had most interested him in his youth, and which events from the many centuries of Chinese history he considered the most important.

"If we are talking about ancient times," Jiang Zemin said, "I would mention Emperor Qin Shihuang, who united China. As for our country's recent history, a great role in overthrowing the feudal regime was played by Sun Yat-sen.

"The most important event in China's recent history was the birth of the Communist Party. It was thanks to the creation of the CPC that China embarked on the path of independence and national development, and a once poor and backward country changed in the space of a few decades. I recall the words of Chairman Mao Zedong that the creation of the Communist Party was for China equivalent to the creation of a new world. I also recall his words that the shots fired in the October Revolution had brought Marxism-Leninism to us. Among China's contemporary politicians I most admire the older generation of our revolutionaries—above all, Comrade Mao Zedong. It was under their leadership that China was able to break with its semicolonial past and uphold its independence and autonomy. Under their leadership too we were able to achieve immense success in socialist transformations and socialist building.

"At the Third CPC Central Committee Plenum, 11th Convocation, the party leadership headed by Comrade Deng Xiaoping decided to build 'socialism with a Chinese face' in the PRC. At the same time, the course of implementing the reform and open-door policy was put forward. The past 11 years have shown that we have already achieved great success, which has been recognized around the world. Under the party's leadership we will continue to travel this road in order to turn China into a modern, powerful socialist state."

The time came to move on to the official part of the interview.

[Correspondents] Your visit to the Soviet Union begins in a few days' time. How do you assess the importance of Soviet-Chinese summits for the further development of mutually advantageous cooperation between the two countries in all spheres?

[Jiang Zemin] I am very glad that I will shortly be visiting the Soviet Union, which is our great neighbor.

Two years ago the historic meeting between Comrade Deng Xiaoping and Comrade M.S. Gorbachev took place in Beijing. For the past two years, thanks to the common efforts of both sides, Sino-Soviet relations have been making progress in all spheres. Contacts and communications are maintained between the leaders of the two countries and the two parties. Our countries' foreign ministries have held a number of consultations on international issues of mutual interest. Trade and economic ties have been further developed. Exchanges in the sphere of science, technology, education, culture, health, sports, and so forth are becoming more frequent. A start has been made on exchanges in the military sphere too. Practice shows that the normal and healthy development of good-neighborly and friendly relations between China and the Soviet Union on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence accords not only with our peoples' fundamental interests and aspirations, but also with the interests of preserving world peace and stability.

I am confident that my coming visit will promote the further deepening of the traditional friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, and the further development of friendly cooperation between our countries in all spheres.

[Correspondents] China has entered its second decade of the reform policy implemented under the Communist Party's leadership. What are the main features of this policy at the present-day stage?

[Jiang Zemin] China will resolutely and consistently implement the reform and open-door policy. Our reform is a question of the self-improvement and self-development of the socialist system. It is designed to promote the development of productive forces, the comprehensive progress of society, and the continuous improvement of socialism's viability and dynamism. Currently we are mainly emphasizing the improvement of the environment, the bringing about of economic order, and the deepening of the reform process. In the past 10 or so years China has achieved enormous success in implementing the reform and open-door policy. The economy has started to develop more rapidly, there has been great progress in the social sphere, and the people's material and cultural living standard has increased noticeably. That is the gist and main point of the reform. Nonetheless, there have been certain failings too. If we sum up what has been done in the past, we can at least draw the following conclusions: First, we cannot do without the reform and open-door policy; second, in implementing this policy we must be guided steadfastly and resolutely by a socialist orientation; third, we must proceed on the basis of actual reality, be resolute and courageous, and try to put balanced methods and steps into practice. We have realized this still more profoundly following the Seventh CPC Central Committee Plenum, 13th Convocation, and the Fourth Chinese National People's Congress Session, Seventh Convocation. As for the further implementation of the reform and open-door policy, we should continue our work to generalize and sum up matters theoretically, and to enrich and improve the elaboration of political directives with a view to both continuously deepening the reform process and to further improving our effectiveness in expanding foreign ties.

[Correspondents] What, in your opinion, is the importance for the expansion of cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region and the strengthening of international peace and security of developing and strengthening relations between the PRC and the USSR as the two major socialist states?

[Jiang Zemin] China and the Soviet Union are neighboring countries. The total length of the border between them is more than 7,000 km. The PRC and the USSR, as permanent members of the UN Security Council, bear a great responsibility for the preservation of peace and stability in both the Asia-Pacific region and worldwide.

The development of good-neighborly and friendly relations between China and the Soviet Union as two major socialist countries on the basis of the five principles of peaceful coexistence is of great importance for the preservation of peace and stability in the Asia-Pacific region.

As for economic cooperation between China and the Soviet Union, it is highly complementary and there are also specific favorable geographic conditions for it. Consequently, our countries have great potential for mutually advantageous cooperation. Such cooperation between the PRC and the USSR will have a positive effect on the development of economic cooperation in the Asia-Pacific region.

[Correspondents] The PRAVDA festival was held in Moscow in early May. Foreign guests, including a RENMIN RIBAO delegation, took part in it. What, in your view, is the role of the party press in perestroyka and reform? In what areas could cooperation between our party newspapers develop?

[Jiang Zemin] I believe that the party press is capable of being the fastest vehicle for bringing the party's political line to the people's attention. There is no doubt that our party newspapers will continue to play an important role in mobilizing the broad masses to participate actively in perestroyka and reform.

I am convinced that party newspapers' activities should be based on a socialist orientation and promote the preservation of social and economic stability and the strengthening of the people's unity and cohesion. In short, they should promote the renewal of socialism. If the party press adopts a false approach in covering transformations, this will do major damage to perestroyka and reform. We in China have already learned a similar lesson.

As for PRAVDA and RENMIN RIBAO, there are longstanding ties between them. These ties have now been restored, and over the past two years active contacts and exchanges have developed between our party newspapers. RENMIN RIBAO took part in the recent PRAVDA festival, showing a photographic exhibit there.

I hope and believe that the cooperation between RENMIN RIBAO and PRAVDA will be further developed, and that the party newspapers will constantly discuss our peoples' lives, exchange experience of socialist building, and promote the strengthening of Sino-Soviet friendship.

[Correspondent] What would you like to say to Soviet people on the eve of your new visit to Moscow?

[Jiang Zemin] The Soviet people are a great people. Under V.I. Lenin's leadership they created the world's first socialist state and thereby opened up a new era in mankind's history. In World War II against fascism the Soviet people suffered major casualties, and they played a great part in defeating fascism. In the past 70-odd years the Soviet people under the CPSU's leadership have achieved major successes, recognized throughout the world, in socialist building. Currently Soviet people are facing a number of temporary difficulties, but we are fully confident that the great Soviet people will definitely be able to surmount these difficulties and emerge victorious. I would like to take this opportunity to express my profound respect for the great multinational Soviet people and wish them happiness and prosperity.

Titarenko on Jiang Zemin's Moscow Visit

OW1205131291 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1000 GMT 11 May 91

[From the "Along the Road of Friendship and Cooperation" Program]

[Text] Dear listeners, Comrade Jiang Zemin, paramount leader of China, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, and chairman of the PRC Central Military Commission, is scheduled to arrive in Moscow for a formal visit in the middle of May. We invite Soviet sinologist Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences, to talk about what significance the visit will have on development of Sino-Soviet relations.

The upcoming visit by Chinese leader Comrade Jiang Zemin is in return for the visit made by Soviet leader Comrade Gorbachev to China in May 1989. Comrade Jiang Zemin's visit to the USSR and the talks he will have with Soviet leaders show that Sino-Soviet relations are continuously developing and that, since relations were completely normalized in May 1989, they have continued to deepen and expand in an all-around way.

Comrade Titarenko continued: Sino-Soviet relations have been developing on the basis of the Five Principles of Peaceful Coexistence. Both the USSR and China have experienced and learned from confrontation. This kind of confrontation, which began in the late 1950's, lasted more than 20 years. The principal theory is that only cooperation, good-neighborly relations, and mutual understanding, instead of confrontation, serve the interests of the people of our two countries. This kind of pragmatic approach adopted by the USSR and China laid a sound foundation for promoting development of bilateral relations in all fields. In the two years that have passed since Comrade Gorbachev's visit, political, economic, educational, cultural, and scientific cooperation, as well as cooperation in other fields, were expanded extensively, and relations between the two parties were restored. Meanwhile, both sides actively explored ways to solve issues left behind by history—namely, the border issue and reducing armed forces deployed along the border. Economic ties and trade, [words indistinct] contacts, and scientific cooperation between the two countries are being continuously expanded. All possibilities and resources remain to be fully exploited by both sides.

Finally, Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute and doctor of philosophy, said that Comrade Jiang Zemin's visit to the USSR and talks he will have with Soviet leaders will promote in-depth development of Sino-Soviet relations.

Titarenko on Sino-Soviet Economic Ties

OW1105103791 Moscow Radio Moscow in Mandarin 1300 GMT 7 May 91 91

[From the "Half An Hour With Wang Xiao" program]

[Text] Comrade Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee, will soon visit the Soviet Union. The Soviet people are greatly interested in this upcoming visit. Dr. Titarenko, director of the Far East Institute of the Academy of Sciences, has commented on this event. He noted the political significance of Comrade Jiang Zemin's visit and how it will strengthen good-neighborly relations between the two countries. Today, Comrade Titarenko will review on Sino-Soviet economic ties.

Comrade Titarenko said: We have a good basis for developing bilateral relations, that is, geography. We share an extensive border. In addition, because of the nature of our economic coordination, China and the Soviet Union are not rivals or competitors; instead, we are mutually-supportive partners.

Titarenko pointed out: I think it is very important that a long-term program be instituted. On the one hand, we can jointly develop economies in Siberia, the Soviet Far East, and Soviet Central Asia; on the other hand, we can also jointly develop Chinese provinces and autonomous regions bordering these regions.

There are bright prospects for cooperation. First, we can rebuild or renovate those large industrial projects built with Soviet aid in China in the 1950s. The task both China and the Soviet Union are carrying out is the creation of highly advanced technology and develop intermediate-level technology [zhong ji gong yi]. The Soviet Union and China can coordinate effectively in promoting the most effective modernization of these enterprises, which are an important part of Chinese industries.

Comrade Titarenko noted: In addition, supplying these enterprises with advanced equipment can promote the development of industry in the Siberia, the Soviet Far East, and Soviet Central Asia. We can develop cooperation not only in supplying technology and equipment but also in designing and producing equipment. This is because China now has adequate experience and trained skilled engineers, technicians, and scientists. Therefore, the Soviet Union and China can learn much from each other.

Comrade Titarenko said: One major problem seriously obstructing the development of Sino-Soviet economic and other cooperation is communications and transportation. It is necessary to expand land and air transport networks between the two countries. Today several railways, including the Alma-Ata-Urumqi railway, cannot adequately meet cargo transport requirements. Relevant units in both countries are currently studying the question of extending old and building new railways and highways. The Chinese have made a good suggestion: Build a railroad bridge across the Amur River to join Blagovescensk to Heihe. There will be further discussions concerning cooperation, expansion, and use of the Soviet North Asian Railway. Current use of this railway is very low.

Comrade Titarenko concluded: Active use of this railway can play a great role in improving cargo transport between our countries.

Yazov Reviews Visit to PRC

PM1005164991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent Yu. Savenkov: "First Visit by a Defense Minister"]

[Text] Beijing— Marshal of the Soviet Union D.T. Yazov, USSR minister of defense, has paid a five-day official visit to China at the invitation of Colonel General Qin Jiwei, PRC minister of defense. The XINHUA agency, reporting on the Soviet minister's meeting with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Council, highlighted the following words by D.T. Yazov: "The Chinese people are working, they are creating things of value, and, at the same time, they have at their disposal all the potential to defend their own achievements."

Before flying home, the USSR defense minister answered an IZVESTIYA correspondent's questions.

"It is the first official visit to China by a USSR defense minister at the head of a military delegation. Such a visit did not take place even during that period long ago when we were allies. This very fact made the visit the center of attention. What were the results of your trip and what did you discuss with your Chinese colleagues?"

"The visit took place as a result of the improvement of Soviet-Chinese relations at all levels," D.T. Yazov said. "It was the result of M.S. Gorbachev's new policy and his successful trip to China two years ago.

"Yes, there was a time when our relations were strained. Although I do not think there was any particular confrontation. Wariness, more like. As a consequence, our forces massed in the Transbaykal region and Central Asia and Chinese forces in Xingjiang. Who benefited from this? We did not, and neither did they. So the wheel eventually came full circle, returning to common sense. This is the way we are now tackling security questions: cutting armed forces to reasonable levels.

"But there is something I would point out. The interests of general security, and it simply cannot be otherwise nowadays, show that forces can still come in handy. The events in the Persian Gulf demonstrated that. The results of that war are ambiguous. Everyone can see that there are seats and sources of tension, but there are also attempts to exploit the situation for particular ends.

"When I addressed the Chinese National Defense Academy, I talked about the structure of the USSR Armed Forces, the development of our military reform, the prospects for cooperation with the Chinese People's Liberation Army, and the Soviet approach to the solution of the problems of security in the world and in the Asian-Pacific region. Incidentally, friendship, mutual understanding, and cooperation between the USSR and China are today acquiring special significance as a factor of world stability.

"In Shanghai we visited a naval base. It was a pleasure to see the neat, trim sailors and the fine condition of the equipment. In Guangzhou I visited the air force fighter division and met with some pilots.

"There were very constructive meetings with China's top leaders and talks with the PRC defense minister. The main event was the meeting with Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the CPC Central Committee and chairman of the PRC Central Military Council, who will soon be coming to the USSR on an official visit."

"What is your assessment of the reduction of armed forces and the confidence-building measures in the military sphere in the area of the Soviet-Chinese border, the longest border in the world?"

"There have now been three rounds of talks. There will be a fourth in June. Both sides, as far as I know, are satisfied with the development of events. We are tackling everything within the framework of the defensive doctrine. We are turning large combined-arms units into machine-gun and artillery divisions. I will cite one small detail: We still have concrete pillboxes from the thirties in the border area. As you can see, we are threatening no one.

"Our peaceful intentions are surely indicated by the following step. As you know, explosions will ring out on 12 May and our last intermediate- and shorter-range missiles will be no more. This is the result of our accords with the United States. Incidentally, we had a formal right to keep 100 missiles in Asia. But what we want is a nonviolent, nuclear-free world. Who would they be directed against? Japan? China? There is no logic in it. So we are taking a goodwill step: We are destroying these missiles too."

Beijing Embassy Spokesman on Relations

LD0905124991 Moscow World Service in English 1200 GMT 9 May 91

[Text] The Soviet Union and China no longer pose a threat to one another. This point is made in a statement of the Soviet Embassy in Beijing after a visit to China by the Soviet defense minister, Dmitriy Yazov. An embassy spokesman pointed out the great significance of the statement made for the first time. The Soviet- Chinese border, the statement runs, must become a border of friendship. An accord has been reached to invigorate the negotiating process for a border settlement. The Soviet Embassy spokesman emphasized that the sides had agreed to exchange information in the military area.

Northeast Asia

U.S. Nuclear Arms Withdrawal From ROK Viewed

SK1305051391 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1200 GMT 11 May 91

[Sergey Petrov commentary from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] The United States has been studying the possibility of withdrawing all nuclear weapons from the ROK. Quoting military sources, SEOUL SINMUN and CHUNGANG ILBO have reported on this. Our station commentator Sergey Petrov writes:

Many more signs of change in the U.S. Administration's policy toward the Korean Peninsula are showing than ever before. These include moves toward reducing the U.S. military presence and the reported agreement to hold soccer matches in Pyongyang between U.S. and DPRK players.

In its report, CHUNGANG ILBO indirectly hinted that the White House appears to be changing its positions. No U.S. officials have confirmed this.

While the situation has been continuously improving on the Korean Peninsula, the North-South premiers' talks have not yet been resumed. The ROK has recently been undergoing a most serious social and political crisis as antigovernment demonstrations spread. The North and South have been bickering over Seoul's plan to apply for the UN admission. Also, Pyongyang has been unwilling to place its research reactors under the control of the International Atomic Energy Agency.

Therefore, particular attention has been focused on the reported plan to withdraw nuclear weapons. However, if [words indistinct], the removal of nuclear weapons will not help fundamentally change the situation. The problem is that U.S. nuclear weapons in the ROK include mines, bombs, Lance and Honest John missiles, and neutron shells. As CHUNGANG ILBO reported, it is planned to replace all these with ultramodern missiles. This will be [words indistinct] of the U.S. 7th Fleet in the Pacific. These missiles will have longer ranges, be more precise, and be loaded with more powerful warheads. Moreover, the 7th Fleet could and can make unrestricted calls at ROK and Japanese ports. Washington's position on whether U.S. military ships are loaded with nuclear weapons is well known. Under no circumstances will Washington make an affirmative reply. In other words, they are or are not loaded with nuclear weapons. This is not a frank reply. This is because nuclear weapons are not of a tactical nature but of a strategic nature on the Korean Peninsula.

My experiences tells me that U.S. nuclear weapons have lost their significance here as in Europe. Nuclear accidents have occurred in Chernobyl and other places. Only those who are suicidal would try to attack or defend with the use of these brutal weapons. Washington surely knows this very well in view of the fact that it has decided to reconsider its military principles toward the Korean Peninsula. I believe that the United States will take responsible measures to massively reduce its military presence in the ROK and to soon withdraw nuclear weapons from the ROK.

Antigovernment Demonstrations in ROK Viewed

SK1305101191 Moscow Radio Moscow in Korean 1200 GMT 12 May 91

[Sergey Petrov commentary from the "Focus on Asia" program]

[Text] Avoiding the current crisis in the ROK will be very difficult. One of its causes is that the present No Tae-u government has not radically democratized the country's political and social systems, legacies of the Chon Tu-hwan regime. The legacies of the dictatorship, which include a crack down with police clubs and tear gas on dialogue by dissident forces, and the National Security Law, still remain.

Moreover, the dissident forces are changing. Unlike before, they are not likely to put up in their minds with the privilege of the ruling Democratic Liberal Party [DLP]. Although the DLP has recently won victory in local elections, that victory will not be consolidated. In large cities across the country, the basic election of [word indistinct] will be conducted.

More than a year is left until the expiration of the presidential tenure. But the dissidents are going to use the student's death in Seoul for political purposes today. Solving events in political circles, where subsequently the DLP is in a difficult situation, will require holding parliamentary and presidential elections before the presidential tenure is up.

President No Tae-u has been aware of the seriousness of the current situation. If the bloodshed continues, his party will lose the support of eligible voters. Because of this, he has taken a bold political step and dismissed the minister of home affairs and disbanded the special police unit. He has also taken into custody the policemen who are responsible for the death of student Kang Kyong-tae. In connection with the death, he has issued a statement of regret. The issue of releasing approximately 200 political prisoners, who are in prison on charges of violating the National Security Law, was also discussed. Among the demands of dissident forces, he has only refused to accept the resignation of the government, and this is only a requirement from the dissident organization. But it is not likely to be his final statement. The ROK will be strained for at least a week.

According to remarks by the organizer of the Kang Kyong-tae [word indistinct], the rallies and demonstrations will continue until 18 May, which marks the 11th anniversary of the Kwangju uprising. By then, several hundred people will continue to be arrested and more people will be newly victimized. The commentator Sergey Petrov has pointed out that there will develop a situation in which will be forgotten the old truth that violence will only breed more violence.

Southeast Asia & Pacific

Nguyen Van Linh Moscow Activities Reported

Hanoi Radio on Visit

BK1005053591 Hanoi Domestic Service in Vietnamese 2300 GMT 9 May 91

[Text] According to a VNA correspondent in Moscow, Comrade Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee currently visiting the Soviet Union, on 9 May visited and laid wreaths at the Lenin Mausoleum, the monument of unknown soldiers, and President Ho Chi Minh statue in Moscow.

After the ceremony, a large group of war veterans and people comrade surrounded Nguyen Van Linh at the monument to express their sentiments, sincere friendship, and admiration for the Vietnamese people and their beloved and esteemed President Ho Chi Minh.

In the afternoon, comrade Nguyen Van Linh visited the Soviet armed forces museum. Colonel (Sokrov), director of the museum briefed the comrade general secretary on the art and other items depicting the heroic history of the Soviet armed forces and the achievements of the Soviet people in the struggle against Fascism. Comrade Nguyen Van Linh wrote in the museum's visitor book: I am very moved by this visit to the museum to commemorate the victory over Fascism. Together with progressive mankind, the Vietnamese communists and people will forever remember the glorious victory of the great Soviet people and the heroic Soviet armed forces, who firmly maintained the achievements of the October Revolution and smashed Fascism in World War II, thereby firmly defending the national independence of the Soviet fatherland and protecing the freedom of nations. This brilliant victory has created favorable conditions for the success of the revolution in many countries, including the August Revolution in Vietnam. I wish the fraternal friendship and militant solidarity between the peoples and armed forces of Vietnam and the Soviet Union will last forever.

Accompanying comrade Nguyen Van Linh were comrade Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Political Bureau and many high-ranking cadres of the CPSU Central Committee. On the Vietnamese side were Le Xuan Tung, alternate member of the CPV

Central Committee and assistant to the general secretary; Nguyen Manh Cam, member of the CPV Central Committee and Vietnamese ambassador to the Soviet Union; and Vu Khoan, vice minister of foreign affairs.

PRAVDA Summarizes Talks

PM1205144791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 91 Second Edition p 1

[TASS report: "M.S. Gorbachev's Meeting With Nguyen Van Linh"]

[Text] The third Soviet-Vietnamese summit meeting was held 11 May between USSR President M.S. Gorbachev, general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee.

It is exactly four and two years respectively since their first and second meetings. In that time, cardinal changes have taken place both in their countries and in the whole world. The things that both leaders thought about then have, in many ways, been confirmed by the difficult but inevitable processes that have unfolded in the USSR, Vietnam, and the world arena since then. This makes their current exchange of opinions all the more topical, M.S. Gorbachev and Nguyen Van Linh stated. The situation requires the collation of positions on international questions, and in particular it requires the deepening and improvement of bilateral relations.

Nguyen Van Linh gave a detailed account of what progress is being made in the implementation of the decisions of the Sixth Congress of the CPV, which has been pursuing the line of the profound renewal of the country within the framework of the socialist choice, and of how the three basic programs are being carried out: improving agriculture and resolving the food problem; sharply increasing the output of consumer goods; and resolutely expanding exports to the USSR and other countries. There has been success in all three directions, but the most tangible success has been in the first one.

Despite all the differences in the conditions in which all the forms of social life in the two countries are being reformed, it is being discovered that they have much in common: not only in the novel problems that have arisen in the course of the transformations, but also in approaches to resolving them, in particular in overcoming the command system of running the economy and developing market relations, and in solving the historic task of combining personal interests and incentives for work with the common social aims of society's movement.

One of the subjects of discussion was the party's role in the new conditions, the forms of its activity that ensure the trust of the masses in its ability to creatively reinterpret the new realities and elaborate a policy that would meet the needs of the times and the people's vital interests. The problem of uniting economic and political democracy was discussed, and the preparation of new CPV and CPSU programs was mentioned in this connection. Nguyen Van Linh asked M.S. Gorbachev to familiarize himself with the draft program that will be discussed at the next party congress in June. M.S. Gorbachev assessed this as the reaffirmation of friendly and genuinely comradely relations between the parties.

Of the international problems, the greatest attention was paid to the Cambodian settlement. In principle, the positions of the USSR and Vietnam are very close here. But serious problems still have to be resolved on the path to turning Cambodia into an independent, neutral state open to good relations with its neighbors and other countries.

During the conversation, the significance of Soviet-Vietnamese, Soviet-Chinese, and Vietnamese-Chinese relations for each of the countries, the whole of Asia, the Asia-pacific region, and on an international level, was discussed. M.S. Gorbachev and Nguyen Van Linh noted with satisfaction a perceptible improvement in these relations.

Their positions on the general problems of the Asia-Pacific region practically coincide, as the exchange of opinions showed. Reflections on the role and opportunities of various countries actively participating in the processes of this region also proceeded in the same vein.

As for economic cooperation between the USSR and Vietnam, then the work carried out by heads of government V.S. Pavlov and Do Muoi during the latter's recent visit to Moscow, was fully approved. Mutual accord as regards building cooperation on the basis of full equality of rights and mutual benefit, and taking into consideration the situation at the present moment and in the long term, was stressed, and it was deemed necessary to continue improving the whole mechanism of bilateral economic cooperation.

M.S. Gorbachev and Nguyen Van Linh advocated the development of the relations between the two countries and peoples in every way possible, and—while adapting to the new conditions and needs of the two countries themselves and of the world—advocated the responsible and careful preservation of all the best and most useful elements that have been accumulated in the past decades in Soviet-Vietnamese friendship. The meeting between the leaders of the two states and parties was an important step in the development of their relations in the new historical phase.

Do Muoi Delegation Concludes Moscow Visit

BK1005030091 Hanoi Domestic Service in Vietnamese 2300 GMT 9 May 91

[Text] According to a VNA correspondent in the Soviet Union, Comrade Do Muoi, member of the Communist Party of Vietnam [CPV] Central Committee Political

Bureau and chairman of the Council of Ministers, concluded his working visit to the USSR on 9 May and left Moscow for home.

Seeing Chairman Do Muoi off at the airport in Moscow were: on the Soviet side, Velichko, Soviet deputy prime minister, and Khamidulin, Soviet ambassador to Vietnam; and on the Vietnamese side Nguyen Manh Cam, member of the CPV Central Committee and Vietnamese ambassador to the USSR, and officials of the SRV Embassy in Moscow.

During his visit to the Soviet Union, Chairman Do Muoi visited the SRV Embassy and met with Vietnamese cadres, workers, and students currently working and studying in the USSR. He briefed them on the situation in Vietnam and urged them to strive to satisfactorily fulfill their tasks while contributing to strengthening the SRV-USSR relations of friendship and cooperation.

Moscow Issues Communique

LD1005133691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1228 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 10 May (TASS)—On the Soviet side, "support was expressed for the steps taken by the SRV to establish relations of peace, stability, and cooperation in Southeast Asia, and the processes of normalizing Vietnam's relations with China and the United States." This is noted in a communique, issued here today, on the results of the Soviet-Vietnamese talks.

Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, was in Moscow 5-9 May on a working visit at the invitation of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers. Valentin Pavlov, head of the Soviet Government, and his Vietnamese counterpart had a detailed discussion of the state of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation and came to the one view that it has broad prospects.

While exchanging views on the Cambodian problem, the sides confirmed their intention to continue to make an active contribution toward achieving a comprehensive settlement of it by political means. It was noted that favorable conditions are now taking shape for overcoming the pause in the negotiating process and for speeding up the solution of the question.

Do Muoi Hails Cooperation Accords

LD1205172891 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Commenting on the talks now ended in Moscow with Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, the Vietnamese press notes that the strengthening and expansion of the traditional relations of friendship and all-round cooperations with the Soviet Union represent a fundamental foreign political course of the Communist Party of Vietnam and the Vietnamese government. In an interview for our correspondent prior to departure from the Soviet Union, Do Muoi said in particular:

[Begin Do Muoi recording in Vietnamese fading to Russian translation] At present, Vietnamese-Soviet cooperation is entering a new stage, a stage of renewal, the aim of which is to heighten the efectiveness of cooperation in the interests of both countries. We believe that Vietnam and the Soviet Union have great potential for expanding mutually beneficial cooperation. During these talks between our delegation and Soviet leaders, both sides confirmed their determination to continue to develop and strengthen Vietnamese-Soviet relations of friendship. We reached important accords on renewing cooperation and, first and foremost, trade and economic and scientific and technical interaction. We are sure that the fulfillment of these accords will help to increase the effectiveness of cooperation between our two countries. [end recording]

IZVESTIYA Summarizes Visit

PM1105202591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[IZVESTIYA headline: "On Results of Soviet-Vietnamese Talks"]

[Text] At the invitation of the USSR Cabinet of Ministers, Do Muoi, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam, was in Moscow on a working visit 5 through 9 May.

Do Muoi laid wreaths at the V.I. Lenin Mausoleum and at the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier by the Kremlin Wall. Flowers were also laid at the Ho Chi Minh monument in Moscow.

The chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers was received by USSR President M.S. Gorbachev. During their conversation the immutability of the two states' course toward further developing and deepening bilateral cooperation was reaffirmed.

The Vietnamese guest had a conversation with A.I. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

USSR Prime Minister V.S. Pavlov and Do Muoi held talks which passed in an atmosphere of comradely mutual understanding.

The heads of government briefed each other on the situation in the USSR and the SRV. Do Muoi expressed support for the measures which are being taken by the USSR leadership to stabilize the socioeconomic and political situation, and for the efforts to preserve the unity of the Union on the principles of a renewed federation. The chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers conveyed warm congratulations to the Soviet people on the occasion of the 46th anniversary of the Victory in the Great Patriotic War. V.S. Pavlov welcomed the initial successes achieved in the implementation of the course toward the renewal of the Vietnamese society and wished the upcoming Seventh Congress of the Communist Party of Vietnam successful work.

V.S. Pavlov and Do Muoi held an in-depth discussion of the state of the Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation and arrived at the unanimous opinion that it has broad prospects. It was noted that the positive changes in trade and economic ties and increasing deliveries of Vietnamese goods to the USSR make it possible to build economic relations between our countries on the whole on a balanced and mutually advantageous footing. Noting the great importance of the intergovernmental agreements signed in January this year on trade and economic cooperation in 1991, and on the the switch to the new mechanism of trade and economic relations, the heads of government discussed specific measures to ensure their implementation.

Accords were achieved on speeding up the work on the restructuring of the mechanism of trade and economic collaboration, the creation of favorable conditions for the development of economic relations between the SRV and USSR union republics, and the development of direct trade and economic ties between Soviet and Vietnamese organizations. Questions pertaining to the settlement of Vietnam's debt to the Soviet Union under targeted and compensation cooperation programs, including deliveries of food and traditional Vietnamese export goods to the USSR were discussed.

The sides agreed to complete work in the near future on the amendment of the terms for cooperation in the extraction of oil and gas on the continental shelf of the south of the SRV within the framework of the Soviet-Vietnamese "Vietsovpetro" joint venture with a view to further enhancing the efficiency of its work and the mutual advantage derived from it.

Cooperation avenues in the sphere of education, culture, science, technology, labor resources, and so forth were also discussed.

During the exchange of opinions on international issues, the chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers rated highly the Soviet Union's efforts in the sphere of disarmament and in ensuring peace and security in Asia and the Pacific region and throughout the world.

On the Soviet side support was expressed for the SRV's steps aimed at establishing relations of peace, stability, and cooperation in Southeast Asia, and for the processes of normalizing Vietnam's relations with China and the United States.

During the exchange of opinions on the Cambodian problem, the sides reaffirmed their intention to continue to make an active contribution toward the achievement of a comprehensive settlement by political means. It was noted that favorable conditions are now emerging for overcoming the pause in the negotiation process, and speeding up the solution of this question.

The USSR and Vietnam welcome the Cambodian parties' consent to a voluntary cease-fire in Cambodia as from 1 May this year, and attach importance to backing it up with the introduction of a moratorium on arms deliveries from outside to all the Cambodian sides.

Do Muoi extended an invitation for a visit to the SRV to V.S. Pavlov. The invitation was gratefully accepted.

The working visit to the USSR of Do Muoi, chairman of the SRV Council of Ministers, has contributed to the further strengthening of the friendship between our countries and peoples, and marks an important step along the road of improving the forms and methods of Soviet-Vietnamese cooperation in the economic and other spheres.

Near East & South Asia

IZVESTIYA Reviews Bessmertnykh Jordan Stop

PM1005185591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Report by correspondent M. Kozhevnikov: "Talks In Amman"]

[Text] Amman— Amman was the second stop in USSR Foreign Minister A. Bessmertnykh's Near East itinerary. He spent exactly 24 hours in the Jordanian capital, staying not just anywhere, but in the royal palace.

The older residents of Amman could not remember an occasion when King Husayn had put up a foreign guest, even of the highest rank, in his own residence. This honor was bestowed on our minister. Observers in the capital commented on the fact, saying that it was a sign of the "special relationship of friendship traditionally linking the USSR and Jordan." It was no accident that much time was devoted during the talks between A. Bessmertnykh and the Jordanian monarch to questions of the development of cooperation between the two countries.

Another important topic of conversation was, of course, the Arab-Israeli conflict. At an impromptu press conference when the consultations were over, our minister remarked that Jordan is situated at the "crossroads of many of the region's problems" and is therefore seeking to play a substantial role in the quest for a lasting and just peace in the Near East. According to A. Bessmertnykh, the dialogue had been useful from every viewpoint and had confirmed that the sides' positions coincide on the main issues under discussion.

A similar statement was made by King Husayn, who expressed profound satisfaction with the results of the talks. He stressed the need for all interested parties to take advantage of the historic opportunity that has emerged of solving the Near East problem.

On the eve of the visit they were saying here that A. Bessmertnykh would meet with Y. 'Arafat in Amman. However, the PLO Executive Committee chairman did not fly to Jordan. Palestinian journalists learned that it had apparently been agreed to hold the meeting later, in Geneva.

Bessmertnykh Terms Talks With Levi 'Useful'

LD1005201291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1916 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 10 May (TASS)—The visit to Israel and the talks with the Israeli leadership are an important stage in the development of relations between our countries, stated Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, USSR minister of foreign affairs, at a joint news conference with his Israeli counterpart David Levi.

We discussed two main blocks of issues with the Israeli leadership, said the Soviet minister—in particular the situation in the Near East and the opportunities that exist for resolving matters dealing with a Near East settlement. We examined the conceptual positions of the two sides—in other words, we attempted to define not only the contours of approaches to the problem, but also practical measures to convene a peace conference, the idea of which is actively being discussed in the world today.

I believe, added Bessmertnykh, that the talks were useful, passing as they did in a frank atmosphere. The important thing—I'd like to stress this—is that we agreed to continue talks on this set of issues.

The second block involved examining bilateral relations and problems of developing ties between our countries. We noted that these relations are developing successfully, but at the same time we believe that there is unused potential.

We acknowledged, the minister continued, that our relations are making steady progress. In a very wide variety of spheres and areas the foundations have been "laid" for the implementation of numerous projects of various kinds. But there is also the prospect of their development, and it is absolutely natural that we are approaching the restoration of diplomatic relations, which will crown this entire process.

According to Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, the chances of holding a peace conference on the Near East are very great, and this is being determined by the development of events not only in the region but also in the world as a whole. "There is hope, which has not yet grown into certainty, that we will be able to move into a new stage of resolving the problem," he added.

TASS Roundup of Bessmertnykh Visit to Israel

LD1005222591 Moscow TASS in English 2204 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo May 11 TASS—Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh made on Friday a brief working visit to Israel. He had a substantive conversation with Israeli Prime-Minister Yitzhaq Shamir and conducted negotiations with Israeli Foreign Minister David Levi.

The minister's visit had the purpose of establishing how realistic is a step towards settling the Middle East conflict with taking into account the specific features of the present situation and statements of the Israeli leadership about Israel's striving for peace.

The conversation took place in a businesslike and benevolent atmosphere. The sides exchanged views about possible steps to ease the situation and factors that still interfere with this.

The Israeli side welcomed the Soviet Union's activity in the Middle East region and joint actions of the USSR and the U.S. towards a Middle East settlement.

The Israeli side expressed interest in closer contacts with the Soviet side, also at the level of foreign ministers. The Soviet minister expressed the readiness for this.

During the conversations the Israeli side voiced serious concern about the danger of the arms race in the Middle East. The Soviet side noted that this problem could seriously aggravate if the present opportunity to begin the peace process be slipped and that this problem merits close attention.

Both sides expressed satisfaction with the fact that Soviet-Israeli relations began to enter normal route in the recent years and became very ramified.

The Soviet foreign minister's visit is the first such event in the history of relations between the Soviet Union and Israel. It is apparently an important milestone in the natural development of Soviet-Israeli relations which will become full-scale diplomatic relations with the passage of time.

At a joint news conference given on Friday at Tel Aviv airport prior to the departure of the Soviet Minister to Cairo, Bessmertnykh and Levi gave a positive assessment to the dialogue they had.

Bessmertnykh Says Egypt Visit 'Very Timely'

LD1005202691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1830 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Krutkhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 10 May (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh, who arrived in the Egyptian capital today during his visit to the Near East, has called his visit to Cairo "very timely."

"We are now living through an important stage at which a good opportunity to start the Near East peace process has emerged," he said at Cairo airport, where he was met by Ismat 'Abd al-Majid, deputy prime minister and Egyptian minister of foreign affairs.

A.A. Bessmertnykh stressed that it is not only important not to miss this opportunity but also to do everything possible on a practical level in order to turn this opportunity into a reality. In his words, the aim of his current trip is "to establish the viewpoints of the leaders of the Near East countries, as it is these very states which will bear responsibility for the fate of their region; and also to share my own views on practical ways to make use of the existing opportunities."

Bessmertnykh, Mubarak Discuss Regional Problems

LD1105082591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0745 GMT 11 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 11 May (TASS)—A meeting took place this morning in the Republican Palace in the Egyptian capital between Husni Mubarak, president of the Arab Republic of Egypt, and USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh who is on a short working visit here.

During the conversation the sides discussed a wide range of issues connected with the start of the process of a Near East settlement, the convening of a peace conference on the Near East, and bilateral relations.

The Soviet minister is currently making a trip around a number of countries of the region during which he has already visited Syria, Jordan, and Israel.

In Cairo there will also be meetings between A.A. Bessertnykh and U.S. State Secretary James Baker. The USSR foreign minister will fly from Egypt to Saudi Arabia.

Bessmertnykh, Egypt's Sidqi Discuss Economic Ties

LD1105174791 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1625 GMT 11 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 11 May (TASS)—Soviet-Egyptian relations, specifically economic relations, was the subject of the main part of talks between Egyptian Prime Minister 'Atif Sidqi and USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh in Cairo today. The sides pointed out that relations between the two countries are developing satisfactorily. However, problems exist, manifesting themselves chiefly in interruptions of economic ties arising as a result of the reestablishment of cooperation on a new basis.

Bessmertnykh: Mubarak To Join Talks With Baker

LD1105120291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0958 GMT 11 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 11 May (TASS)—A trilateral meeting between Egyptian President Husni Mubarak, USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker will take place in Cairo on Monday [13 May]. The Soviet minister, who is on a tour of the Near East countries, announced this today at the end of his meeting with the Egyptian head of state.

Aleksandr Bessmertnykh expressed deep satisfaction with the talks which took place during his meeting today with Mubarak. The minister said they discussed a very wide range of issues, although priority was given to the Near East settlement.

The sides stated their identity of views regarding the concept of the approaches to the beginning of the talks, that is, "an agreement on both sides that holding a peace conference is the most acceptable option of reaching a solution to many issues." According to him, all practical aspects of a possible conference were discussed. The minister termed the coincidence of views "very wide and encouraging."

The minister described the participation of Palestinian representatives as one of the problems of convening a peace conference. "The Palestinians," he stressed, "first should decide this question themselves, and this subject is being extremely actively discussed at the moment."

President Mubarak and Aleksandr Bessmertnykh discussed the state of Soviet-Egyptian relations, which, according to the minister, "are developing very happily," and also a number of global problems, in particular, disarmament issues.

TASS Reviews Joint Egyptian Talks

LD1105212391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1654 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] Cairo, 11 May (TASS)—Talks between USSR Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh and leaders of Near East states continue. On 11 May, the Soviet minister had a lengthy meeting here with Egyptian President H. Mubarak. He also held talks with Prime Minister A. Sidqi. There also were exchanges of views with I. Abd al-Majid, the deputy prime minister and foreign minister, and B. Ghali, the minister of state for foreign affairs and chairman of the "Arab Republic of Egypt-USSR" Friendship Society.

The Egyptian side displayed a lively and friendly interest in the complex processes in the USSR. President H. Mubarak wished the Soviet Union success in implementing its program of large-scale reforms. He expressed clear support for the consistent and well considered policies being pursued by president M.S. Gorbachev.

However, the situation in the Near East, above all the prospects for setting in motion the process of reaching a settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict, was the central theme of all the talks in the Egyptian capital. A comparison of impressions and evaluations and an in-depth analysis of the positions of interested parties and the opportunities for establishing common ground between them, which would make it possible to undo the chronic tangle of contradictions, showed that the approaches of both Moscow and Cairo are in tune with each other. This promises to make the continuation of the close cooperation between them especially valuable and productive. The postcrisis situation in the Persian Gulf, aspects of which continue to cause concern, was also mentioned.

There was an objective discussion of various aspects of bilateral Soviet-Egyptian relations, the state of which is, on the whole, satisfactory. However, there are problems, and most attention was concentrated on these. These problems mainly arise from recent interruptions in economic ties, caused by rearrangement of the mechanism of cooperation. Some specific measures to iron out the problems were outlined.

Today's Soviet-Egyptian meetings took place in the open and constructive atmosphere which is typical of the present state of relations between the USSR and the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Bessmertnykh, Baker Begin 2d Round Talks in Cairo

LD1305080191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0704 GMT 13 May 91

[By correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 13 May (TASS)—USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker today began a second round of talks in the Egyptian capital. During the meeting, which is taking place at the residence of the Soviet ambassador in Cairo, various aspects of the Near East settlement process will be touched upon. Later in the day the heads of the USSR and U.S. foreign policy departments will hold trilateral talks involving Husni Mubarak, president of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

Egyptian Minister on Bessmertnykh-Baker Talks

LD1305080991 Moscow TASS in English 0723 GMT 13 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Mikhail Krutikhin]

[Text] Cairo May 13 TASS—Egypt is fully satisfied with current U.S.-Soviet efforts towards a settlement of the Middle East conflict, Butrus Ghali, Egyptian minister of state for foreign affairs, told British broadcast journalists.

The present meeting in Cairo between Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh and U.S. Secretary of State James Baker is of great significance and is an illustration of the will of the two great powers for cooperation in resolving all problems of the region and, particularly, the Palestinian problem, Ghali said. He voiced optimism about chances for the convocation of a Middle East peace conference which, as he put it, would become an appropriate negotiating framework for achieving peace.

Baker's 'Shuttle Diplomacy' in Mideast Viewed

PM1205134191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 12 May 91 Second Edition p 4

[Correspondent V. Gan report: "Fourth Attempt"]

[Text] Washington—U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker embarked today on the fourth round of his "shuttle diplomacy" in the Near East. The administration is saying that this trip to the region could well be his last, if progress is not achieved on arranging Arab-Israeli talks.

In a discussion with correspondents, President Bush said that he was "moderately optimistic" about Baker's trip, which will take him to Syria, Egypt, Israel, and Jordan, as well as to a meeting with Palestinian leaders. In Egypt the secretary of state will hold talks with Soviet Foreign Minister A.A. Bessmertnykh.

It is being reported that the Americans have presented a number of compromise proposals, with which they hope to overcome the differences between the Near East antagonists. These include convening roughly six-monthly settlement conferences to be sponsored by the United States and the USSR, inviting representatives of the UN secretary general and the EC as observers, allowing the sides to interpret freely the fundamental Security Council Resolutions 242 and 338, and setting up a joint Jordanian-Palestinian delegation.

It is already known that no agreement is visible on many aspects of these proposals; however, Washington nonetheless wants to attempt yet again to arrange an Arab-Israeli dialogue. People here are also hoping that the Soviet Union will use its influence in the Arab world—our agreement to act as one of the conference sponsors was assessed very positively on the Potomac. The pooling of efforts could indeed play a great role.

Incidentally, Soviet-U.S. cooperation in the Near East is seen by the administration as a key element in the program to stabilize the situation in the region.

Bessmertnykh, Baker Give Briefing After Talks

LD1305005891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 2300 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo, 13 May (TASS)—When it is a matter of the forms and conditions for holding a peace conference on the Middle East, then the task constantly comes up against issues that are not yet resolved, stated USSR Minister of Foreign Affairs Aleksandr Bessmertnykh in Cairo, speaking with TASS correspondents after the first round of talks with U.S. Secretary of State James Baker. He added: "These include, for example, the extent of the United Nation's role, and the issue of the continuity of the conference—that is, the manner in which it is to work, whether at intervals or on a standing basis."

The minister said that there are disagreements between the sides themselves and not between the cochairmen of the proposed conference, and that for this reason we want to find an option that will help bring them closer together.

Inasmuch as both the Soviet and the U.S. sides have gone into the matter in some depth, "there are no surprises for us; we are already now studying, as they say, all the nuances of the situation." We are mainly conducting a discussion about what has yet to be done, because for the analysis basically everything has been done, Bessmertnykh added. "A good deal has been achieved. When we started, the range of the problems separating the sides was, generally, wide indeed. Now it has narrowed down to practically two or three issues. But as happens in life, the last issues are always the most difficult to overcome."

In the words of the Soviet minister, a lot of work remains to be done; "there will again be contacts between the sides." For the time being, however, "the discussion has been a good one," he said of his conversation with Baker.

Bessmertnykh expressed the hope that Egyptian President Husni Mubarak's participation in the discussion planned for today "will provide an opportunity to go over certain issues jointly once again." "There is a definite symbolism in the fact that it is in Egypt, in the heart of the region, that the discussion of the fundamental problems of this region is in progress," he said.

The possibility that apart from direct talks between the immediate participants in the conference, "there should also be a group there working on regional problems—water resources, security, ecology, the economy—that is, the kind of problems that you would not resolve in bilateral contacts" was discussed with the U.S. secretary of state, the minister said. Other countries of the region, naturally, should be part of it. Their desire to be working at the conference was to be welcomed, Bessmertnykh observed.

Baker, who answered journalists' questions at Cairo's Semiramis Hotel following his talks with his Soviet counterpart, indicated that they discussed joint efforts to ensure peace in the region and to promote the convening of a Middle East peace conference. There is an understanding that the chief aim of such a conference should be the establishment of a lasting peace on the basis of Resolutions 242 and 338 of the UN Security Council, although it is known that the sides have differing interpretations of these documents. For that reason, forthcoming talks will focus on efforts directed toward coming to a final agreement on the precise interpretation of the above resolutions, the U.S. secretary of state said.

He emphasized once again that there is now far more agreement between the sides than disagreement.

[TASS International Service in Russian at 0625 GMT on 13 May transmits a service message killing the last paragraph of this item.

The service message reads: "In the report Egypt-Bessmertnykh from Cairo 'Bessmertnykh and Baker on Middle East settlement talks' the last paragraph should be killed."]

Bessmertnykh's Lebanon Visit Postponed

LD1105135991 Moscow World Service in English 1300 GMT 11 May 91

[Excerpts] President Husni Mubarak of Egypt, the Soviet foreign minister, Aleksandr Bessmertnykh, and the American secretary of state, James Baker, are scheduled to meet in Cairo on Monday [13 May]. [passage omitted]

There have been changes in the Soviet minister's schedule. The Soviet ambassador in Lebanon has disclosed that Mr. Bessmertnykh is expected in Beirut on Tuesday, not on Sunday, as was earlier announced. It is also reported that the minister may visit Saudi Arabia.

Progress of Bessmertnykh Near East Tour Viewed

PM1305092691 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 13 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Correspondent D. Velikiy report: "Progress on a Near East Settlement?"]

[Text] Cairo—The Near East settlement process has now reached a critical point. USSR Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh is in Cairo—the penultimate destination on his tour of the region—and on Sunday evening he is to meet here with U.S. Secretary of State J. Baker, who will fly into the Egyptian capital in the context of his fourth tour in recent months with the aim of achieving progress in Arab-Israeli relations.

Can it be said that such progress is probable now that both superpowers are making simultaneous efforts to break the deadlock in the whole range of stalled Arab-Israeli relations, or rather, contradictions? Can it be asserted that today looks better than yesterday in this respect? These and many other questions were put by journalists to A. Bessmertnykh when he appeared on the terrace of the presidential palace in Cairo after a long talk with Husni Mubarak.

The head of the Soviet foreign policy department replied with obvious, though restrained, optimism. During the talk with the Egyptian president, Bessmertnykh said, the broadest range of regional problems was touched upon. Naturally, during the dialogue the emphasis was on discussing the quest for ways to begin the peace settlement process. Bessmertnykh and Mubarak reached a consensus on the main aspects of the approach to this problem. The Soviet minister particularly stressed the common Soviet and Egyptian positions on holding a peace conference in which all interested parties should take part. Such a forum is the only way to resolve the problem of Arab-Israeli relations—that is the opinion formulated as a result of the dialogue.

Bessmertnykh's talk with the Egyptian president produced a new nuance in the further development of events: Mubarak proposed that trilateral Soviet-Egyptian-U.S. talks be held in Cairo. And the Soviet Union is prepared to participate in such talks, which could take place on Monday, Bessmertnykh told journalists.

The Soviet minister spoke highly of Egypt's position in the peace settlement process and stated that Egypt will undoubtedly play a very important role in it. As for Soviet-Egyptian relations, they are characterized by the productive dialogue that is conducted between the two states. The need to continue this dialogue is obvious, and that fact was stressed by the Soviet minister.

Nonetheless significant obstacles still remain in the path of the peace-making efforts being undertaken in order to establish a stable and lasting peace in the Near East. It is not easy to achieve a new type of relations in a region torn by wars and conflicts for decades. The existence of these obstacles and the associated problems was reflected in the questions the journalists put to the head of the Soviet Foreign Ministry. Among them was the question of the prospects for establishing full diplomatic relations between the USSR and Israel. We are approaching that time, Bessmertnykh said, but it is still in the future.

The journalists also inquired about the Soviet position with regard to the Palestinian representation at the proposed conference. The resolution of this question is within the competence of the Palestinians themselves, let them choose their own delegation, the Soviet minister stated.

The Soviet foreign minister's tour of Near East countries is even more at the center of attention in the mass media here by virtue of the fact that the progress and possible results of the tour are inevitably compared with what Bessmertnykh's American colleague has achieved in the same sphere in the course of his three visits here. Many observers say that the USSR's active participation in the peace process has considerably widened the settlement prospects, because the USSR's traditional ties with Arab states enable it to conduct talks in a broad political spectrum, and all this generally increases the overall chances of success.

At the same time articles in the Egyptian newspapers contain a fair proportion of skepticism with regard to possible shifts in the Israeli position. Tel Aviv's tough and inflexible policy, AL-JUMHURIYAH writes, is jeopardizing all efforts at a peace settlement. The matter is also complicated by the disunity in Arab ranks, the newspaper adds. But in their general assessments of the present stage in the said process, in which the efforts of several states are interwoven, observers agree that this is the mightiest attack in many years by peace-making diplomacy on the entrenched Arab-Israeli enmity in the Near East.

TASS Overview of Bessmertnykh's Mideast Visit

LD1205204791 Moscow TASS in English 2003 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Mikhail Krutikhin and Georgiy Shmelev]

[Text] Cairo May 12 TASS—Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessmertnykh's working visit to Egypt is the fourth stage of his Middle East Tour. He has already visited Syria, Jordan and Israel where he held talks with the leaders of those states. On Monday, Bessmertnykh will leave for Saudi Arabia.

The talks and conversations the Soviet foreign minister held during his tour have focused on the Mideast situation, prospects for the beginning of the settlement of the Arab-Israeli conflict and the holding of a peace conference. According to Bessmertnykh and the other co-organizer of the peace conference, U.S. Secretary of State James Baker, the present conditions in the region and the world as a whole offer a historic chance for approaching a solution of the Middle-East problem. Baker pointed out that the "window of possibilities" for finding a solution is open.

The Soviet foreign minister's visit aims above all at holding candid and comprehensive talks on all aspects of the Middle-East settlement with all the major participants in the process, at learning about their viewpoints at first hands, at finding out what these approaches have in common and where they differ.

In his address to journalists on Saturday, the Soviet foreign minister described his talks as productive and inspiring confidence.

The sides agreed not to make public the contents of their talks for the time being. But, according to local observers, Syria's present standpoint has become more flexible. They note a considerable degree of coincidence in the viewpoints of the Soviet Union and Jordan. As regards the Soviet minister's talks in Israel, observers believe in Israel's positive attitude toward the Soviet participation in the regional peace process and toward the efforts by the USSR and the U.S. to convene a peace conference. The decision by the Soviet and Israeli ministers to continue consultations regarding this set of problems has been noticed as well.

During talks in Egypt, the sides noted "the consonance of approaches of Moscow and Cairo," which holds out a promise for the continuation of close cooperation of the two countries. Of considerable interest is the decision announced after the meeting between President Husni Mubarak of Egypt and Aleksandr Bessmertnykh on Saturday to hold on Monday a tri-partite meeting between the head of the state of Egypt, the Soviet foreign minister and the U.S. secretary of state to consider practical aspects of the Middle-East settlement.

Supreme Soviet

Supreme Soviet 12 May Session Reported

LD1205203491

[Editorial Report] Moscow Central Television Service Second Program Network in Russian at 1853 GMT on 12 May carries the one-hour "USSR Supreme Soviet session" program, on the proceedings at the USSR Supreme Soviet session in the Kremlin on 12 May.

Lukyanov is shown chairing the sitting.

The announcer says the Supreme Soviet finally passed the law on help for people in the Chernobyl zone and passed the law on military service, which foresees changes for the Navy.

Kotlyar's nomination as Minister of Fisheries is then rejected. Kotlyar is shown on the rostrum.

Following that, changes to labor laws are debated; the president rejected the earlier form of the law, saying that unions should retain the right to intervene in a labor dispute. Gritsenko reports on the work of conciliation commission. He outlines changes which have been suggested, including provisions where workers agreed in advance to redundancy and better provisions for consultation with unions. Gritsenko goes into details of various amendments to paragraphs of the original version.

Lukyanov then announces that an objection has been received from unions about some of the proposed changes to labor legislation. He introduces unions' leader Shcherbakov, who says that the removal of some protections leaves the workers defenseless against employers, and is not in keeping with the law on trade unions. Existing provisions should continue, he says, citing labor legislation adopted by various republics that stipulates consultation with unions.

Later, Lukyanov reads statistics supplied at the Supreme Soviet's request by the Ministry of Justice about appeals against dismissals. The number of cases is very small compared to the overall working population, he notes.

At 1914 GMT Kalmykov speaks for the committee on legislation. He says that he finds Shcherbakov's objections strange, since so many changes have been made already in favor of the unions' views. If the unions want to go right back to their first proposals, the committee could do the same thing, he states.

Later, the announcer says that differences were reconciled, and the law was passed, as well as a resolution on its implementation.

He says that the Supreme Soviet later debated the second reading of the law on entry and exit from the country. Excerpts from a number of contributions to the debate are carried. Deputy Maslin says passing the legislation would be in keeping with international agreements, but at least a year must be allowed to sort out all the problems involved. A major problem could be a massive brain drain, which should be prevented, he states. Better investment in science would help towards this. The law has no provisions for social security for those who go abroad to work; Maslin proposes several amendments.

Deputy Andreyeva then says travel broadens the mind and, on top of that, people returning from abroad bring back hard currency. The approach to laws such as this one must be founded on principle, however, not on pragmatic considerations. It is only fitting that a great country such as the USSR should allow people to come and go freely, she says.

Deputy Sukhov says he thinks the law needs further work and that facilities such as improved customs posts must be made ready. There are more important things to work on than this law; people need to be encouraged to make their own country a fine place to stay.

Laptev comes to the rostrum at 1934 GMT. He recalls that the law has been passed on its first reading. Any changes need to be well signed. Ministries and departments have informed him that a large proportion of the provisions of the law are already being implemented, and successfully. Deputies must take this into account. The essence of debates has had more to do with transitional provisions than with the law itself. The law and resolution on its implementation do not mention finance; this is an important matter, as there is no systematic approach, all the departments are working on aspects in isolation from each other, he concludes.

Following this, Deputy Dzasokhov says that the law is in line with pledges on human rights. Deputies are correct to point out the financial aspects, but departments have to pull their own socks up to meet the requirements of the law, not expect the law to solve their problems for them. It is an important point that the law is aleady being put into effect to a large extent; Dzasokhov gives some figures on extent of foreign travel at present. Some of those, including the United States and Japan, who strongly supported the law at first have changed their stance; other countries will not necessarily be ready to accept people just because they want to emigrate. Dzasokhov suggests the law be passed, along with some precise instructions for the USSR Cabinet of Ministers.

At 1944 GMT Deputy (Bubkevich) says that the law needs further work and suggests other laws should have priority. He is offended at the idea that the USSR should be like a poor country, exporting labor to get money from abroad.

The announcer then says that the resolution on putting the law provoked much debate, and that the final decision will be made tomorrow.

Lukyanov then reads an appeal from People's Deputies from South Ossetia, protesting Georgia's unconstitutional action in abolishing the autonomous oblast, calling for full implementation of the provisions of the state of emergency, and asking for support for their resolution on freeing the area from Georgia's control:

"The Assembly of People's Deputies of soviets at all levels notes that an unhealthy sociopolitical situation has evolved in South Ossetia over the past two to three years."

"The stabilization of the sociopolitical situation and the solution of many vitally important questions have been delayed under the emergency conditions because of the absence of legitimate executive power in South Ossetia. Stating that under the conditions of the state of emergency, in which the larger part of the territory of Tskhinvali and Znauri Rayons has been occupied; a terrible earthquake has destroyed hundreds of national economic facilities; thousands of houses in tens of villages of the oblast and the settlement of Dzhava have been wiped completely off the face of the earth; and in which Leningorskiy Rayon of South Ossetia is cut off from the rest of the autonomous oblast, the Assembly of People's Deputies thinks that the presidential decree of 7 January 1991 and the Supreme Soviet resolution of 1 April 1991 should be immediately executed to their full extent. Proceeding from the above, it expresses alarm over the further development of events in the region and, striving to end the interethnic confrontation between the Ossetian and Georgian people, the Assembly of People's Deputies of soviets at all levels of South Ossetia resolves:

"First, that in executing the presidential decree of 7 January 1991 and the Supreme Soviet resolution of 1 April 1991, the resolution of the 14th session of the Soviet of People's Deputies of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast of 20 September 1990, on the transformation of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast into the South Ossetian Soviet Democratic Republic, be revoked. That is to say, that it be brought into line.

"Second, that the activity of the bodies of state power and government of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast, which functioned up until September 1990, be restored.

"Third, that by taking heed of the extremely complex sociopolitical and socioeconomic situation in the oblast, as well as the state of emergency in the city of Tskhinvali and in Dzhava Rayon, the Assembly of People's Deputies at all levels should be considered to be the supreme body of power of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast before the routine election of local soviets of people's deputies.

"Fourth, that in the period between assemblies the Executive Committee of the Soviet of People's Deputies of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast is the executive and instructing body.

"Fifth, that the Assembly thinks it necessary, based on the statement of the will of the people of South Ossetia expressed during the 17 March 1991 referendum on the preservation and renewal of the Union, that an appeal be made to the USSR Supreme Soviet to recognize the oblast as an independent participant in the treaty on the Union of sovereign republics; that it sign that treaty in the capacity of a subject of the federation; that it form an empowered delegation of the South Ossetian Autonomous Oblast composed of Gassiyev, Kochiyev, Khubulov, Kugayev, and Chekhovin to take part in preparing and signing the treaty; and that the above resolution be published in the oblast's mass media and be brought to the attention of the Supreme Soviet of Georgia.

"[Signed] Chairman of the assembly and secretary.

"I will bring that resolution to the attention of the Supreme Soviet. It is important because, as you can see, an act that was issued contrary to the Constitution and laws of the USSR is being revoked, and the presidential decree and the Supreme Soviet's resolution are being fulfilled. I think that we do not need to and should not approve that resolution, as all deputies in South Ossetia adopted it in such a form. If you do not have any objections, I will hand that over to the Nationalities Policy and Interethnic Relations Commission, which deals with treaty problems. Are there any objections, comrades? [voices say "no"] All right, it is adopted."

The program then ends.

Changes in Military Service Approved

LD1205082291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0740 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Oleg Moskovskiy]

[Text] Moscow, 12 May (TASS)—The Soviet legislature has today made alterations to the law on general liability to military service, reducing the length of service from three years to two years for petty officers and seaman in the Navy and in the naval sections of the border troops. Besides this, a decree has been passed on carrying out an experiment in the Navy involving a partial transition to recruitment on a voluntary basis to make up ships' crews. These resolutions were adopted on the initiative of the USSR Ministry of Defense.

Addressing the deputies, Colonel-General Grigoriy Krivosheyev, deputy Chief of Staff of the USSR Armed Forces, emphasized that the measure that had been presented "is a component of military reform, one of the first major practical steps in perfecting the procedure for the conduct of military service."

In the words of Grigoriy Krivosheyev, to prevent a fall in the military preparedenss of the Navy, the Ministry of Defense has proposed carrying out the experiment in four naval formations between 1991 and 1994 of making up ships crews from the ranks of seamen and petty officers working under contract. The contract is concluded for two and a half years from the time that they complete their first six months of compulsory military service.

Grigoriy Krivosheyev emphasized that the results of this experiment should "provide rich factual material on the reality of establishing a professional army in the country."

Law on Chernobyl Compensation Adopted

LD1205102991 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0900 GMT 12 May 91

[Excerpt] The fifth session of the Supreme Soviet of the country has resumed work in the Kremlin after the holidays.

The first point on today's agenda was the discussion of the draft law on the social protection of citizens who suffered as a result of the Chernobyl catastrophe and the discussion on the decision of bring it into effect. I would like to remind you that the document was adopted on 7 May, except for Paragraph 18 which deals with the distribution of the expenses for the implementation of the legal act between the center and the republics. The paragraph, which has been a stumbling block, has been adopted in its new wording. A decision bring the law into effect has also been adopted. [passage omitted]

Amendments to Labor Law Approved

LD1205125991 Moscow TASS in English 1140 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS legislative correspondent Ivan Ivanov]

[Text] Moscow May 12 TASS—The Soviet parliament made amendments and supplements to the fundamentals of legislation of the USSR and Union republics on labour, defining the role of trade unions in dismissing workers.

The Soviet legislature's decision provides for introducing a differentiated approach to the order of discharging workers, depending on the grounds to break off a contract on the management's initiative.

Addressing the legislature today, Nikolay Gritsenko, chairman of the parliamentary committee on labour and social affairs, explained that a trade union committee must give a preliminary consent for the cancellation of a labour contract due to personnel cuts or due to other reasons when workers are not guilty.

If a worker is dismissed for discipline violations, the management must only receive a preliminary opinion of the trade union committee, which, however, is not mandatory.

The wording worked out by parliament is a compromise in response to a veto imposed by the Soviet president on a law on amendments and supplements to the fundamentals of legislation of the USSR and Union republics on labour, which was adopted by the Soviet parliament in March. Returning that document to parliament, Gorbachev noted at the time that it ran counter to the law on trade unions, rights and guarantees of their activities.

According to the law on trade unions, workers may be dismissed only with trade unions' consent, while amendments to the fundamentals of legislation on labour completely deprive trade unions of this right.

Gritsenko noted that the wording, adopted by parliament today, would increase the protective function of trade unions with respect to conscientious and skilled workers.

At the same time these amendments will preclude unjustified efforts by trade unions to prevent the management from improving discipline at enterprises.

Lukyanov on Gorbachev-Yeltsin Meeting

LD1205141491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1332 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Ivan Ivanov and Aleksandr Kanishchev]

[Text] Moscow, 12 May (TASS)—USSR President Mikhail Gorbachev, together with Boris Yeltsin, head of the Russian legislature, is meeting with the chairmen of the Supreme Soviets of the autonomous republics of the Russian Federation and other autonomous formations this afternoon. This was reported to the members of the country's legislature by USSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Anatoliy Lukyanov.

In the course of the meeting, he said, "a whole range of questions is being discussed—the status of autonomous formations, the right of autonomous formations to sign the new Union treaty and be cofounders of the Union, a whole range of questions concerned with the quotas of the autonomous formations in the top bodies of authority, and other questions. This is a serious, large conversation."

Anatoliy Lukyanov stressed that in the course of the meeting taking place "everyone is advocating signing the new Union treaty as soon as possible, and resolving a whole range of questions which arise in this connection."

Dzasokhov Addresses Deputies on Exit Law

LD1205224991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 1853 GMT 12 May 91

[Speech by Aleksandr Dzasokhov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo, at USSR Supreme Soviet session in Moscow on 12 May—recorded; from the "USSR Supreme Soviet Session" program]

[Text] I share the view of those Supreme Soviet members who have spoken convincingly about the foreign policy and legal aspects of the draft law under discussion. All the same, however, we are coming to the discussion and, I hope, adoption of the law not by reason of the circumstances that many legislatures and congressmen are calling upon us to adopt this law as quickly as possible. The matter really concerns the fact that the provenance of this law is directly connected with the processes that are taking place in our own country, under the banner of democratization and guaranteeing human rights to the full.

Second, I share the concern of those comrades who have concentrated our common attention on the necessity to ensure the financial and organizational and technical side of all the provisions of the draft bill submitted. At the same time, it is quite clear that previously, today, and in the future, we shall not be able to adopt such laws, especially such wide-ranging ones, in such a way as to anticipate absolutely all the possible accompanying circumstances.

Moreover, some of the arguments to do with the way it should be done were, I think, also meant to provoke debate, to begin with, at least. For what is at stake is not to resolve the pressing problems of many of our departments on account of this law; what is at issue is that the relevant ministries should bring their capabilities into line with implementation of this law. Moreover, the law is indeed, as was very convincingly spoken of by Ivan Dmitriyevich [Laptev], in operation, comrades, it is already in effect.

Even if, today, we arrived at a point of view adding up to rejection of the law, I can tell you that in 1990 more then 400,000 people left to live abroad permanently according to the existing legally binding and legislative acts in effect in our country. As has been rightly said, the greater part, the majority of them are concentrated within two or three nationalities of our fellow citizens. Some 3.7 million people went abroad on business. The forecasts of Soviet and foreign experts do not differ by much; they really come together in that on the whole there is a prospect for stability of these figures, hence the forecasts concerning 15 or 20 million and so on are quite without grounds.

Furthermore, comrades, there have recently been striking changes that should be taken into account, that those who were calling upon us to pass the law—primarily with political considerations in mind—frequently with sincere arguments that we should bring our domestic acts of legislation into line with the multilateral documents that the Soviet Union has already signed, they have fundamentally changed their approach at the state level. I can inform you, I will say this at the Supreme Soviet, that the desire to emigrate does not mean that the receiving side is prepared to accept the application of this or that Soviet citizen regardless of profession and so on and so forth. This applies to the United States, Western Europe, Canada, New Zealand, and to Australia. All those countries take as their starting point that this will be very strictly controlled.

Now, concerning the feedback. I would like to inform you that little Yugoslavia, following the bringing of order to these processes of migration, used to receive $2.5 billion for the budget as returning funds in connection with the fact that Yugoslav citizens who emigrated, as a result of the regulation of their wages paid over within the country—that is, they were acting in accordance the law passed about this. Meanwhile, comrades, things in our country are out of control at the moment. A vast multitude of people leave the country, one can say, illegally. Furthermore, we are ourselves one of a couple of dozen countries, perhaps, that have not 5,000 but more than 200,000 foreign citizens on their territory, working here in the Soviet Union—on the Volga, in Serbia, and in other regions of our country. They are Italians, Koreans, Chinese, Syrians, and so on and so forth. So we have a great multitude of foreign citizens working here in our country.

My proposal boils down to this: to endorse the law in principle, or rather I would even put it this way, pass the law, and then as the second point—I have the wording here according to which it would be prescribed that the Cabinet of Ministers should work thoroughly through the provisions of the resolution accompanying it within a timescale acceptable to us, preserving without fail the perspective of this deadline, and in this case it is unprecedented, a whole year. The third thought, it demands attention—we have heard of it here—that perhaps this is the very draft law that should have been sent for familiarization, perhaps for a higher level of understanding on the part of the republics.

Political & Social

Gorbachev Warns U.S. Against 'New Cold War'

LD1105191291 London PRESS ASSOCIATION in English 1818 GMT 11 May 91

[By Tom McMullan, PRESS ASSOCIATION diplomatic correspondent]

[Text] A new cold war could develop between the Soviet Union and the United States, according to Soviet President Mikhail Gorbachev. President Gorbachev is quoted in an interview in the SUNDAY TIMES newspaper as saying that the Soviet Union is moving towards chaos. This was because the Soviets were abandoning the command economy. "If we stop the process we could have to reimpose the command system," he said in an interview with Rupert Murdoch, chief executive of News International, which owns the SUNDAY TIMES.

Mr. Gorbachev said that the right wing in the US was seeking to put pressure on the Soviet Union, and had "succeeded in making changes in American policy". Mr. Gorbachev said: "If we allow the US-Soviet relationship to deteriorate there will be a new cold war. Or at least rainy weather."

The Soviet leader is also quoted as saying: "America should not fish in troubled waters. It will be dangerous to exploit the current facts. Current differences between us must not become a test."

Mr. Gorbachev said it might be better not to have a summit between himself and President Bush "if only one side wants it."

Prime Minister John Major said earlier this week that he was consulting partners in the G7 group of the world's main industrial nations on whether Mr. Gorbachev should be invited to attend the economic summit in London in July. According to Whitehall officials, the US was thought likely to have most reservations about such an invitation.

Gorbachev Meets With Autonomous Republic Heads

CM1305100391 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 13 May 91 Second Edition p 1

["Meeting of USSR President and RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman with Chairmen of RSFSR Autonomous Republic Supreme Soviets"]

[Text] A meeting was held in the Kremlin 12 May. Taking part in the Kremlin today to discuss preparations and the procedure for signing a Union treaty. Taking part in the meeting were President Mikhail Gorbachev, chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Republic Boris Yeltsin, chairmen of the Supreme Soviets (legislatures) of the Bashkirian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Murtaza Rakhimov, the Buryat Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Sergey Buldayev, the Kabardino-Balkarian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Valeriy Kokov, the Kalmyk Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Vladimir Basanov, the Komi Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Yuriy Spiridonov, the Mari Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Vladislav Zotin, the Mordova Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Nikolay Biryukov, the North Ossetian Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Akhsarbek Galazov, the Tatar Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Mintimer Shaimiyev, the Tuva Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Chimit-Dorzhu Ondar, the Udmurt Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Valentin Tubylov, the Chechen-Ingush Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic D.G. Zavgayev, the Chuvash Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Anatoliy Leontyev, and the Yakut Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic Mikhail Nikolayev.

Questions of the preparations and the procedure for signing the Union treaty were discussed.

Participants agreed about the need to promptly complete work on the draft of the new Union treaty. The signing of the treaty is a decisive condition for stabilizing the economic and political situation, overcoming the crisis and returning the life of society to its normal course.

The republics which are part of the Russian Soviet Federative Socialist Republic are vitally interested in safeguarding the integrity of the Russian Federation and the Soviet Union, consolidating friendship and developing cooperation among all peoples of the homeland.

All prerequisites are now available for the accomplishment of this historic task. An all-union referendum has been held, during which the peoples of Russia spoke out in favour of preserving and renewing the Union. The agreed-upon text of the new Union treaty has been drafted by the efforts of the authorized representatives of republics. A joint statement by the Soviet president and the leaders of nine Union republics defined prospects for further preparatory work and transformations which should be implemented after the conclusion of the new treaty.

The participants in the Kremlin meeting supported the general approach towards the solution of this problem. They confirmed that the republics they represent will sign the new Union treaty as subjects of the USSR and the RSFSR through their authorized delegations.

Mintimer Shaimiyev declared that Tatarstan intended to sign the treaty only as a subject of the USSR, and to subsequently conclude a treaty with the Russian republic.

Speakers stressed that the harmonization of interests of republics within the renewed union could only be dependably guaranteed if the federative system principles tested by the world experience would be consistently adhered to.

Speakers agreed that the present difficulties could only be overcome through joint action by the bodies of state authority of the USSR, the Russian Federation, all republics, different political movements and patriotic forces of society.

Taking part in the meeting were chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Anatoliy Lukyanov, First Deputy Chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation Ruslan Khasbulatov, Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation Ramazan Abdulatipov, and Deputy Chairman of the Council of Nationalities of the USSR Supreme Soviet Boris Oleynik.

Union Treaty Discussed

LD1205162991 Moscow TASS in English 1613 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 12 TASS—President Mikhail Gorbachev and Russian parliament leader Boris Yeltsin met with the leaders of Russia's autonomous republics today.

The five-hour meeting focussed on the preparation and signature of a new federal treaty.

"We heard and understood well each other," parliament leader Vladislav Zotin from Mari told TASS afterwards.

He said the main result of the meeting was agreement on the need to sign the new Union treaty as soon as possible.

Asked if the meeting had hammered out a mechanism for autonomous republics' participation in the signing, parliament leader Anatoliy Leontyev from Chuvashia said: "The right to define specific procedures for signing was left to the legislatures of the republics themselves."

Most of them have already decided to sign the new Union treaty directly, although also as part of the Russian delegation.

Meeting Not 'Unusual'

LD1205140891 Moscow TASS in English 1400 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 12 TASS—A spokesman for the Soviet president's press service told TASS by telephone that "there is nothing unusual" in Mikhail Gorbachev's meeting with leaders of autonomous republics.

The leaders of the Russian Federation's autonomous republics did not take part in the president's meeting with leaders of nine Union republics in Novo-Ogarevo in April, in which the ten signed a joint statement. The autonomous republics, however, "have accumulated a lot of questions" connected with the elaboration of a Union treaty, he said.

Today's discussion should be viewed as a "working, business" meeting, a link in the process of drafting a new Union treaty, the press spokesman said.

Stankevich: Gorbachev Should Remain Leader

AU1005092491 Vienna DIE PRESSE in German 10 May 91 p 4

["B.B." report: "Nothing Is Impossible in Soviet Union"]

[Text] Vienna—"If it is not again one of his political maneuvers, the joint declaration of President Gorbachev and the nine leaders of republics has undoubtedly to be evaluated as a breakthrough," Moscow Vice Mayor Sergey Stankevich said at a news conference in Vienna. Of course, in the present situation Gorbachev can longer afford another maneuver: "This would be political death for him," Stankevich said.

The young Moscow vice mayor was in Vienna for several days at the invitation of Josef Riegler, chairman of the Austrian People's Party [OeVP], and held numerous talks with local top politicians. The historian and political scientist commented on Gorbachev's present power base: "With the CPSU he is on the point of losing his last base and he can only rely on the KGB, the Army, and the police; but these institutions are good for repression, not for reforms."

Gorbachev, therefore probably had no other way out than to come to terms with Boris Yeltsin and eight other republic leaders. Only in this way will there be any chance of a long-term, political stabilization, Stankevich believes. He also considers it necessary that Gorbachev remain the leader of the USSR for the time being: "Precisely in foreign affairs he is the embodiment of continuity. He is a politician whom the outside world trusts."

Stankevich evaluates the Russian Federation's seizure of control over the mines on Russian territory as a "Pyrrhic victory of Yeltsin." For it is clear that many of these mines are simply not profitable. In his opinion, the Russian Government should entrust international experts with the examination of the economic situation of the mines.

Does Stankevich think a military coup is possible? "Nothing is impossible in the Soviet Union, as history proves. However, the likelihood of a military coup is currently very small."

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 11 May

LD1105073291 Moscow TASS in English 0558 GMT 11 May 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 11 TASS—The PRAVDA and KRASNAYA ZVEZDA newspapers focus on festivities devoted to the V-day, which the Soviet Union celebrates on May 9. They were held in the capitals of Union and autonomous republics, territorial and regional centres, in Soviet cities and villages.

The newspapers report wreath-laying ceremonies at the graves of the fallen, meetings of war veterans, demonstrations and rallies.

They write about a meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev and representatives of the All-Union Young Army Men Movement, which took place on Thursday. The movement's task is the patriotic upbringing of the younger generation and assistance to war and labour veterans.

Addressing the gathering, the Soviet president said that he wants "to remember all the peoples, who made a contribution to the great victory, above all the anti-Hitler coalition nations".

"We shall remain true to the words pronounced on the elbe on those victorious days of May 1945," Gorbachev stressed.

PRAVDA reports that strikes were suspended at the overwhelming majority of collieries in the Kuznetsk coal basin, western Siberia, and Vorkuta, Komi Autonomous Republic. Collieries are doing the first steps to bring work back to normal.

PRAVDA writes about the situation in Transcaucasia. It gives the summary of a statement by the Presidium of the Armenian parliament, expressing concern over the position of residents in Armenian villages bordering Azerbaijan and the fate of people arrested during combat operations.

The newspaper says that the troops of the Interior Ministry, the KGB and the Defence Ministry "are implementing measures to disarm illegal groups in the zone of the ethnic conflict on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border", operating in compliance with the presidential decree of July 25, 1990.

The newspaper quotes a statement by Azerbaijani President Ayaz Mutalibov that "the leadership of the Union is fulfilling its duty to the Azerbaijani people, ensuring the protection of the Republic's sovereignty and territorial integrity".

He told this to two foreign journalists, who came to the Republic to write stories about the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region and on the border with Armenia.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA prints an interview with Nikolay Ryzhkov, who headed the Soviet Government until recently. He decided to run for the presidency of the Russian Federation. The elections will be held next June.

Ryzhkov notes that he is now working on the electoral platform and "intends to offer a moderately radical road, which will not lead to much suffering for the people". He opposed the private ownership of land and favoured multistructural agriculture.

In the opinion of the former prime minister, the country must not abandon the road towards a market economy. At the same time, "taking into account that some economic processes went out of hand, it is necessary to apply strict state regulation", including agriculture, the light industry and the basic industries.

PRAVDA carries an article about problems with the preparation for the next Soviet-American summit to be held in Moscow. What are these problems?

"The official explanation is that the sides have not settled some outstanding issues of a forthcoming agreement on the reduction of strategic offensive weapons," the newspaper notes.

However, PRAVDA stresses, "differences on treaties are a symptom of the difficulties rather than their cause". "The cause apparently is that Washington decided to correct its policy towards the Soviet Union."

it is already possible to discern some "new" aspects of Washington's policy: firstly, "not to make haste with concluding Soviet-American agreements", secondly, "to deal not only with the centre but also with our Union republics".

In the newspaper's opinion, "both aspects are being initiated by supporters of a tough line". The article notes that "if the two trends will take root in Washington's policy, they will cause substantial losses to the two countries and the entire world".

PRAVDA runs a story on the tenth anniversary of Francois Mitterrand's presidency. The newspaper points to the considerable role played by Mitterrand in bringing closer the positions of the Soviet Union and France in the human rights area and in understanding human values.

The press reports a brief working visit by Soviet Foreign Minister Alexander Bessmertnykh to Israel.

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press 12 May

LD1205071391 Moscow TASS in English 0558 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 12 TASS—Newspapers report that the third Soviet-Vietnamese top-level meeting between President Mikhail Gorbachev, general secretary of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee, and Nguyen Van Linh, general secretary of the Vietnamese Communist Party Central Committee, took place here on Saturday.

They pointed out in particular that the current situation calls for the examination of their positions on international issues and, particularly, for the deepening and refinement of bilateral relations.

During the discussion of international problems, attention was focused on a settlement of the Cambodian conflict. Newspapers emphasise that the meeting between the leaders of the two countries and parties is a big step in the development of their relations at a new historical stage.

The press reports that the presidents of the Soviet Union and the United States resumed their contacts over the telephone on Saturday. They had a lengthy talk on the most topical items on the Soviet-U.S. agenda.

The importance of the talk is primarily in the fact "that the two presidents reaffirmed their commitment to their mutual policies towards improvement of Soviet-U.S. relations, which has already contributed a good deal to the world process and to the solution of major international problems. Constancy in these relations is of decisive importance" for the building of a new, peaceful order in the world.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA newspaper carries a statement by the Politburo of the Central Committee of the Russian Federation Communist Party.

The will of the third extraordinary Congress of Russia's People's Deputies—which "called on all political forces to cooperate"—was ignored and that "the first step in the implementation of the decision on the redistribution of powers in the top echelon of power in the Russian Federation was an "increase in political confrontation rather than a search for ways to get out of the deep socioeconomic crisis", the statement pointed out.

There is a contribution to PRAVDA by Nikolay Stolyarov, chairman of the Central Control Commission of the Russian Federation Communist Party.

In an article headlined "The Past Cannot Be Regained" he writes in particular: "I am surprised at people who think that order will be restored and all things will be put to their proper places if the country reverts to the days of prohibitions, strict orders and directives". One should not delude oneself, Stolyarov emphasises. "No one ever managed to regain one's youth or the past," he observes.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA criticises the Russian Cabinet of Ministers' economic programme, the text of which was circulated among deputies at the Third Congress of Russia's People's Deputies.

The same newspaper carries an address by the Coordinating Council of the Patriotic Forces of Russia to the people's deputies of the Russian Federation. The council requests a postponement of Russia's presidential election to a later date.

PRAVDA, TRUD, and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carry dispatches from the border areas of Azerbaijan and Armenia.

On June 12 people in Russia, for the first time in the republic's history, are to choose one candidate out of several ones and elect him the first-ever president of the Russian Federation. A presidential election procedure is described in TRUD by Vasiliy Kazakov, chairman of Russia's Central Electoral Commission.

A market and the press are the subject of an interview with Mikhail Nenashev, chairman of the USSR State Committee for Publishing, in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA newspaper.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA writes about the museum in Gorkiy Leninskiye in Moscow region where Lenin spent the last months and days of his life. The memorial estate is now under the threat of ruin.

The same newspaper carries a dispatch on the stay of USSR People's Deputy Yegor Ligachev in Donetsk as guest of coal miners.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA, reporting meetings between coal miners and former Politburo member of the Soviet Communist Party Central Committee Yegor Ligachev, quotes him as saying that "if communism collapses, the same will happen to the working class, farmers and intellectuals, for communism reflects their interests most fully."

President Gorbachev sent a message of greetings to participants and guests of the first international ballet dancing contest, named after Malika Sabirova, in Dushanbe, the capital of Tadzhikistan. The message is published in SOVETSKAYA KULTURA newspaper.

The same newspaper as well as SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA carry articles dedicated to the centenary of the birth of writer Mikhail Bulgakov. The birth anniversary falls due on May 15.

In their international-news sections, newspapers report talks held by Soviet Foreign Minister Aleksandr Bessertnykh in Israel and Egypt.

PRAVDA runs articles on Sino-Soviet trade and cultural relations. The modernisation of the Chinese economy is the subject of an article in SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA.

"Freedom Is the Possibility To Create" is the headline under which RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA newspaper carries an interview with Kalevi Sorsa, a prominent figure among Finnish and internatinal social democrats.

TASS Reviews Soviet Central Press for 13 May

LD1305065391 Moscow TASS in English 0603 GMT 13 May 91

["Press Review"—TASS headline]

[Text] Moscow May 13 TASS—Today's issue of PRAVDA opens up with a photograph captioned "the last explosion". "It Is an Explosion That Will Save the World?" is the headline of a report by the newspaper's correspondent from the Kapustin Yar missile range in Astrakhan Region where the last Soviet mobile RSD-10 missiles, referred to in the West as SS-20, were destroyed on Sunday.

"The first and major phase of the Soviet-U.S. Treaty on the Elimination of Intermediate- and Shorter-Range Missiles has been completed. Thus, by eliminating almost two thousand nuclear missiles, we have made the first practical step along the difficult road to a world without weapons," PRAVDA emphasises.

Reporting a meeting of the president of the USSR and the chairman of the Russian Federation parliament with the parliamentary chiefs of the autonomous republics of the Russian Federation, PRAVDA points out that participants in the meeting agreed it was essential to finalise work on a draft new Union treaty soon.

The conclusion of a Union treaty is a decisive condition for stabilising the economic and political situation and overcoming the crisis, PRAVDA notes.

Publicist Aleksander Ilyin reflects in PRAVDA on difficult, untrodden pathways of restructuring in the Soviet Union. Perestroyka, he writes, was predetermined by the entire course of the country's socio-economic development.

"We know those who have the right to be held in respect for the courage of the first step towards radical changes. And still: perestroyka has its roots in the people," Ilyin observes.

Political news analyst Aleksander Nikitin expresses his opinion about the reform of prices as one way to stabilise the economy.

"We should seek to switch over to world prices. This would enable the country not only to trade with foreign partners more beneficially but also to make the first step towards the convertibility of the ruble, at home at first and then abroad," he points out.

In a dispatch from Vilnius Yu. Stroganov comments on the complex situation in Lithuania, the alignment of political forces, the aims and policy of the Lithuanian Sajudis Movement for Perestroyka.

"People in the republic discuss the future of Lithuania and ways for its development. In this situation, the Lithuanian leadership, losing prestige among the bulk of the population owing to its inefficient internal and foreign policies, is busy implanting an atmosphere of hatred and intolerance in the country," the journalist writes.

There is a dispatch by PRAVDA's special correspondent Yu. Shabanov from Armenia's and Azerbaijan's border areas where veritable combat operations unfolded. He describes how officers and soldiers of the Soviet Army and Interior-Ministry troops try to disarm nationalist militants and restore tranquility in the land "darkened with grief and wrath".

Jiang Zemin, general secretary of the Chinese Communist Party Central Committee, gave an interview to Soviet journalists on the eve of his official visit to the Soviet Union. The interview is published in today's PRAVDA.

The Chinese leader highly assessed the importance of meetings between top leaders of the neighbouring countries and voiced hope that his forthcoming visit would contribute to further strengthening the traditional friendship between the peoples of China and the Soviet Union, and emphasised the importance of Sino-Soviet friendship as an important factor of stability in the Asia-Pacific region and throughout the world.

Juergen Moellemann, German minister of economics, was interviewed by PRAVDA's correspondent Ye. Grigoryev in Bonn. "Relations with the Soviet Union are of major importance to us," Moellemann said. "Through continuous and intensifying cooperation in all branches of the economy we also want to contribute to invigorating the process of reforms in the Soviet Union".

Noteworthy among foreign topics is PRAVDA's commentary headlined "There Is No Way back" about events in southern Africa.

One of the world's troubled spots—southern Africa—is now living through a critical period, the commentary points out. The destiny of individual countries and peoples and the region as a whole depends in many respects on how events will develop in the near future. The matter concerns the processes of political, national and racial reconciliation in South Africa, Angola, and Mozambique.

In an article headlined "The Autumn of Patriarchs", I. Tarutin dwells on the collapse of authoritarian and despotic regimes in Africa.

The black continent is changing its power structures, he points out. Anti-government unrest swept many countries of the continent, breaking the dam of the Africans' boundless patience and giving vent to their [word indistinct], making leaders to heed the voice of grass roots that demand freedom and democratisation.

The collapse of authoritatian regimes in African countries was prompted by the events in eastern Europe, which served as a detonator of the discontent of popular masses, Tarutin writes.

PRAVDA reports competition between leading U.S. military industrial companies for a major contract of the 1990s for the production of a new-generation of tactical jetfighter, describes the "illusions and drama" of 120,000 Vietnamese refugees in south-east Asian countries, writes about the Canadian Government's efforts towards a "clean Arctic" and reports a scandal connected with orders placed for the construction of apartments for Soviet servicemen who are now in Germany.

The newspaper TRUD reports details of Armenian militants' "fourth attempt" on the life of V. Polyanichko, chairman of the organising committee for Nagorno-Karabakh, second secretary of the Azerbaijan Communist Party Central Committee and USSR people's deputy in Stepanakert, on May 10.

TRUD carries an interview with Igor Jurgens, secretary of the council of the USSR General Confederation of Trade Unions, who spoke about the confederation's international activities.

More on Gorbachev Address to Young Army Men

PM1105133591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 May 91 First Edition p 1

[TASS report on M.S. Gorbachev Kremlin Meeting 9 May with members of the Young Army Movement: "A Sure Civic Choice"]

[Excerpt] [passage omitted] Dear friends, said M.S. Gorbachev addressing the members of the Young Army Men Movement.

I sincerely and cordially greet you on behalf of the entire leadership of the country and of the CPSU Central Committee in this magnificent hall in the Kremlin, in the heart of our great motherland, he continued. I also greet all your comrades in arms, so to speak, who have remained at home.

Your movement reflects the mood of our young generation which is ready to serve its fatherland and which is aware of its responsibility for the state's destiny. And the fact that this meeting is taking place today, on such a portentous day, emphasizes the continuity of the generations.

Yes, our people secured a Great Victory. A hard, grim victory. And we are all proud of it. I share the words of esteem and gratitude uttered here which were addressed primarily to our veterans of the Great Patriotic War. I wholly align myself with those words and am glad to honor with you the victors of 1945, the front-line fighters and those who wrought victory in the rear. Let us pay due tribute to that heroic generation. In triumphing, those people, accomplished what would seem to be something incredible.

The victory demanded such sacrifices, such efforts that make it incumbent on us to remember them for all time. And to be ever capable of defending our country so that no one will be tempted to test our strength. Therefore I want, with you, to greet here the defense minister, the generals and officers, and through them the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and our entire glorious Soviet Army and Navy.

It has always been a characteristic of our peoples to pay due tribute to all those who side with a just cause at difficult moments. And I want with you today to say a few kind words in remembrance of the representatives of all the peoples who made their contribution to our common Great Victory and to greet from here, from the St. George's Hall in the Kremlin, all the peoples of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, and all people of good will who fought against fascism. May they hear this. We and you have a mandate to say that we remember this combat collaboration which annihilated fascism. We remain loyal to those words, those mutual assurances that were uttered on the Elbe and at other meetings in the victorious days of May 1945.

As president, I want to say a big thank-you to you, dear young friends, for what you are doing and above all for your concern for the veterans. And for what you are doing to preserve the memory of the feat of those who gave us that Victory, the opportunity to continue living, building, overcoming difficulties, and forging ahead.

It is remarkable that good patriotic feelings have appeared in you in your young years. I am sure that you will preserve such feelings for the rest of your lives and I congratulate you on this civic choice. It is the moral high ground where I wish you to remain for all time however difficult things might be for you in your life. Preserve that choice which you have made now in joining the ranks of the Young Army Men Movement. Thank you once again.

I am doubly pleased at having this meeting too because representatives of our republics and of the most diverse nationalities are present here. This is yet another good and very important symbol, a token of friendship and of that sacred cause which has always helped us out at the most difficult turns in our complex, heroic, but also dramatic, history. Safeguard this friendship and continue it. I hope that you will correspond with each other and tell your friends about these meetings.

I know that after this meeting you will all have gained extra friends and I congratulate you on that. There is nothing greater that sensing true friends at your side as you travel life's journey. Everything is easier then. I congratulate you on that. And it is very important that you young people so worthily represent all the peoples of our country. After all, unfortunately, some people, even, shall we say, mature people or extremely mature grown up men and women are not always able to do that as worthily as have many generations and not just in preceeding decades but also in previous centuries in this country where hundreds of peoples reside. You are fine guys because you have realized that the main thing is to be together. This is a very good thing. Preserve this and your national dignity but beware of the pestilence of national arrogance and haughtiness. Be friends. That is what I call on you to do.

In this great perestroyka time of ours—a difficult time—we need mercy, kindness, sympathy, and involvement. What you are doing nurtures precisely such characteristsics in you. I wish you the successful continuation of the great cause of which you have become participants in your young years. Bear aloft the banner of the Young Army Men and hold it firmly. In no way are we producing from ourselves people planning to conquer any territory belonging to others. No. We have a lot of land, our expanses are enormous. For a thousand years to come we have everything for the development of all our peoples. But we must give this some thought and do everything to ensure that things are tranquil and safe in our home.

Now to the main thing: I regard your movement as one in which young lads, young hearts can find friends, acquire much that is new, and come to know the significance of the continuity of the generations in our difficult history and find for ourselves our proper place in life. This is what I see as the chief meaning of this movement and I greet you and also your mentors—those who are present here and those who, with your friends, are now most likely marching to the eternal flame in order to revere the feat of our people in the Great Patriotic War.

Let me express my tremendous satisfaction at this meeting and welcome you all once again in the Kremlin. I want you to remember these days for all time. I wish you great success in what you do.

Gorbachev Discusses Autonomy With Volga Germans

AU1005145391 Munich SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG in German 10 May 91 p 10

["Kue" report: "Gorbachev Receives German Delegation"]

[Text] Moscow—After the split of their "Rebirth" movement in the spring, President Mikhail Gorbachev received a group of Germans in the Soviet Union. Headed by Chairman Boris Rauschenbach, only a delegation of the officially recognized organizing committee for a German congress planned one year ago was invited to the talk. "Rebirth" Chairman Heinrich Groth, leader of a majority that insists on the reestablishment of the formerly autonomous Volga republic, was not invited.

According to Gorbachev's spokesman Vitaliy Ignatenko, the president discussed the creation of an "extraterritorial" autonomous body for the scattered group of 2 million people with the delegation of the organizing committee. On the other hand, the TASS news agency reported vaguely that during the exchange of opinions it was stated—by somebody not mentioned—that the "question of the reestablishment of a German state system [deutscher staatlichkeit] on the Volga" must be solved "in stages." Meanwhile, the establishment of "national districts" and "village Soviets" is to be initiated in compact German settlement areas.

Hugo Wormsbaecher from the organizing committee, a participant in the talk, said that it was more productive than expected and constitutes a "change." It was agreed that a "committee for the problems of Soviet Germans" would be formed in Gorbachev's new cabinet of ministers. However, a "state commission" for the Germans has existed until now.

Groth told SUEDDEUTSCHE ZEITUNG on the telephone that he had tried to get an appointment with the president by means of a telegram one month ago. The selection of the invited people shows "that the president wants to play a game with us, instead of solving the question." After the Soviet Government's short-term cancellation of the German congress in March, the group around Groth nevertheless organized an incomplete congress with about half of the delegates. Groth had himself elected chairman of a German Provisional Council for the Reestablishment of the Volga Republic.

The idea of a German autonomous body without territorial autonomy on the Volga comes from the CPSU Central Committee apparatus. However, the committee planned in the ministers' cabinet will not be elected, but appointed.

Ignatenko said that the talk in the Kremlin dealt with the "very complicated and delicate problem" of "how to bring the position of the Soviet Germans into line with their significance in the Soviet society, without being detrimental to areas of the former autonomous German republic." An "official structure" that "might be extraterritorial and not limited to a single area where the German community is living" was discussed. Immediately after the Wehrmacht's invasion in 1941, Stalin deported the Russian Germans behind the Urals and dissolved the Volga republic.

Groth said that his group is pinning more hopes on the Russian parliament. It adopted a law on the rehabilitation of suppressed peoples, which mentions "territorial rehabilitation," but also a "transition period" in April.

Pavlov Interviewed on Economic Reform, Government

PM1305091491 Rome LA REPUBBLICA in Italian 9 May 91 p 11

[Interview with Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov by Fiammetta Cucurnia in Moscow; date not given]

[Text] Moscow—"The main task now facing our economy to extricate the country from the crisis is the convertibility of the ruble. But for this to be possible, the USSR needs Western aid. If it does not receive it we will not be able to do that. We will be forced to choose between returning to the past and disintegration on a large scale. We have therefore decided to request it, officially this time, at the next meeting of the world's seven most highly industrialized countries." In his sparsely furnished office in the State Construction Department among shelves covered with old dictionaries of the Russian language and a tiny portrait of Lenin casually placed on a small table against the wall, Valentin Pavlov, prime minister of the USSR for just four months, spoke quietly about his anticrisis program, the successful and failed reforms, the country's crisis, and his hopes for recovery following the agreement between the republics and Mikhail Gorbachev. In his words, a mixture of emotion and realism, you could hear the burden which weighs on the man sitting in the armchair—the most unpopular man in the country, isolated on the right and the left, inundated with criticisms, forced to take increasingly unpopular measures, but sincerely convinced that this is the USSR's last chance.

[Cucurnia] Prime Minister, what, in practical terms, is this "special regime" which is about to be imposed on Soviet enterprises?

[Pavlov] We are living in a period in which a new parliamentary system does not yet exist while the old one is no longer functioning. Consequently, new laws desgined and drafted independently of each other are still being adopted in a kind of revolutionary wave. In these conditions, society is losing its sense of the real priorities and, like any organism, is setting defense mechanisms in motion. The "special regime" is an invention closely linked to our present situation, given the fact that our state does not have the means of influencing vital levers for preventing the destruction of the state organism. I will give you an example: If the ambulance service were to go on strike, there would certainly be an increase in mortality. We must therefore prevent that irrespective of the opinions and interests of those working in that sector. We need a system of control for the sectors which form the basis of the state and economic structure. We are not talking about a "state of emergency," arrests, repressions, or the use of the army. We are talking about being able to use administrative and, if necessary, penal pressure to impose the functioning of those structures and prohibit even strike calls. But given that we are deciding to impose limits on people's freedom, it is obvious that we also need to provide economic privileges for those categories.

[Cucurnia] When will these measures come into force?

[Pavlov] Immediately, I think. Whether people like it or not. This partly because the miners' strike has cost the country dear and it will cost us a lot to repair the damage. A presidential decree has already been prepared. We discussed it with Gorbachev yesterday, but it will be issued after the holiday, probably at the end of the week.

[Cucurnia] The republics, especially Russia, are very critical of your economic program. Not only do they reject it, but they say that it will lead the country to disaster. Do you really think that it is possible to implement it in these circumstances?

[Pavlov] All the republics' representatives, including Lithuania and of course Russia, took part in drawing up the program. The Russian Supreme Soviet Presidium separately discussed and then apporved the plan, although nobody is saying that. I therefore think that the critics are essentially pursuing specific political objectives.

Negotiations With The Republics

[Cucurnia] Do you intend to alter the program to take account of the positions expressed by the republics following the agreement signed with Gorbachev?

[Pavlov] Even the name is being changed: It will be called the Program of the USSR Council of Ministers and of the Governments of the Republics. On 12 May in the village of Marozovko there will be a meeting of republican representatives to agree the final draft of the text on the basis of the various programs drawn up at local level. The details, the timetable, and the division of power will finally be defined. Then on 15 May there will be the final meeting of the government chaired by Gorbachev to prevent complications in view of the fact that he is a democrat whereas I am a dictator.

[Cucurnia] During the last party plenum, you launched a proposal to form a coalition government. What are the real prospects for this offer in present circumstances?

[Pavlov] So far I have not received any replies at all. But I am prepared to include anybody in the government, irrespective of nationality, and whether or not they belong to a party. I only ask that they should be competent people. It would be useful if only because it would make it possible to really tackle and solve some problems which cannot be solved in isolation.

[Curcurnia] Valentin Sergeyevich, after months of agitation, the miners have returned to work thanks to the agreement signed by your government which transfers management of the mines to Russia. What do you think of that solution? Do you think that the miners' example will be followed by other sectors?

[Pavlov] I think that we have attached very dangerous importance to this problem of republican or Soviet jurisdiction. If we are really moving toward a market economy, there is no point deciding now who will control the enterprises on our territory. This is not the problem. The problem is one of ownership, of who will bear economic responsibility for managing enterprises and for their results, who will receive the profits and pay the costs. I am convinced that we need to create the right conditions for turning state ownership into shareholding or private ownership.

The Property Reform

This must be the basic criterion. However, the simple division of ownership between the Union and the republics will be carried out under the terms of the law by 1 July, as agreed. Therefore, at the 15 May meeting, we want to propose that some of the property is not automatically transferred from central to republican jurisdiction, but, so to speak, thrown into the water to learn to swim.

[Cucurnia] However, so far, you have not even managed to privatize a certain proportion of businesses. Many people think that the privatization of enterprises is just a dream, remote and unattainable.

[Pavlov] Come now.... Who would buy a business before the wholesale market has become a free market? Who would take such a risk, knowing that you would have to continue paying bribe after bribe to obtain goods from the state distribution centers? It is obvious that before taking a risk people ask whether it is worth the trouble.

[Cucurnia] In just four months your government has succeeded in making enemies with all the USSR's most famous economists. What do you think has been its greatest success?

[Pavlov] Don't imagine that it was easy to introduce the price reform. Not many people are willing to take such a risk, in our country. The first price reform was planned in 1982, right on the eve of Brezhnev's death. When Andropov came to power someone told him that it was inadvisable to carry out such a revolution immediately after his accession to the Kremlin. Who would have thought that the responsibility lay with a dead man? I remember, we hurriedly withdrew all the price lists that had already been distributed. Then Chernenko actually ordered the destruction of the lists that had been collected. The reform of the Gorbachev era was planned for 1987, on the occasion of the famous July plenum. But, as you can see, it has only just been introduced. Of course, it is not a total derestriction of prices. We could not do that, because we could not allow uncontrolled inflation, without knowing what lies at the end of the tunnel. We were forced to contain this process in order to be able to deal at the same time with the other task, which can now no longer be put off: the convertibility of the ruble.

[Cucurnia] What is your government asking of the West?

[Pavlov] Hitherto the prevalent attitude of the West has been more or less as follows: Let us wait and see what they manage to do, then we will decide whether and how to help... I will say, with the utmost sense of responsibility, that the West's help is now becoming essential to us. We need contributions of goods, finance to support the ruble rate, stock market investments, and a number of other things that will enable us to open up the borders and the market. This will make real competition possible in our country, too. Hitherto we have confined ourselves to sounding out the West's willingness. Now we must officially request this aid, and we will do so at the meeting of the Seven.

[Cucurnia] Will Gorbachev attend as the USSR's representative?

[Pavlov] That it not up to us. But we certainly have no choice: We must secure a definite answer, "yes" or "no," so as to be able to organize ourselves and to know whether we can move ahead or slow down until we almost stop.

[Cucurnia] Valentin Sergeyevich, to find someone in the USSR who has not yet demanded your resignation is rather like seeking a needle in a haystack. Do you personally feel secure in your position?

[Pavlov] The prospect of resignation has pursued me since the first day, immediately after my appointment. Frankly, I am not attracted by this post. Believe me. I had been considering leaving for some time. I was thinking about it even when I was finance minister in the Ryzhkov government. And I thought about it precisely because that cabinet's decisions seemed to me biased, deliberately slow, and the result of a compromise within the government. The only thing that keeps me here now is that whoever took over my post would need time to become effective. And our country really cannot allow itself to waste any time.

Further Progress Made on Union Treaty Draft

PM0905160391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Nationalities Policy and International Relations Commission, for SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA by TASS commentator L. Yermakova—place and date not given; first paragraph is introduction: "Disagreements Still Remain"]

[Text] The Union treaty so far exists only as a draft. When will it become an operative juridical document? The TASS correspondent addressed this question to G.S. Tarazevich, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Nationalities Policy and International Relations Commission, who has been taking part in the work on the draft.

[Tarazevich] The question is not a straightforward one. The published draft—which is already the second—is the fruit of the labors of the authorized representatives of the republics; true, not all of them. However, to say that it is a document that is ready for signing would not be entirely correct.

First of all, on completion of work on the document we ended up with around 10 alternative versions of various articles or of parts of this or that article. The process of agreeing positions and interests—and in the recent phase the republic representatives devoted roughly three weeks basically to this problem—has been complicated. I think that it is possible to understand why interests do not coincide—the republics are different; moreover, there were delegations from 18 former autonomous entities participating in the work.

The results of the work have shown that agreement can be reached. And this is the main thing, I think. Whereas last summer during consultations in the Kremlin, in which only representatives of the Union republics were participating, there was a huge divergence of opinions, the negotiations in question have confirmed that they can be reduced to common positions.

[Yermakova] And what problems have provoked the fiercest debates?

[Tarazevich] Passions have especially boiled around what is essentially the key problem in the Union treaty—the delimitation of powers between the Union and the republics. Between the Union as a federal state, and the republics as entities of the federation.

It should be said that the draft, which we formerly described as the president's draft, has undergone qualitative changes. The republic representatives decided to divide the problem into two parts. To the first they assigned the powers which the republics transfer to the exclusive competence of the Union.

The second group of questions they assigned to the joint jurisdiction of the Union and the republics. The mechanism will be complex. Obviously, an addendum to the treaty will have to be worked out to make provision for the mechanism for effecting the joint powers, especially in cases where disagreements arise between individual republics and the Union.

[Yermakova] So the Union treaty will require yet more supplementary documents?

[Tarazevich] Of course. It is no coincidence that a new article, No. 25, has appeared, called the "Addendum to the Treaty." This article says that there are addenda to the treaty expounding the procedures, the mechanism, and the timetable for the realization of its articles. The list of addenda and the timetable for drafting and signing them are to be agreed by the republics participating in the treaty named in the protocol.

[Yermakova] Who is to prepare them?

[Tarazevich] The republics, as the article in question says. But let us return to the treaty. The most diffiult problem—the delimitation of powers—is flanked by two adjacent problems: the problem of ownership and the problem of forming the Union or Federal budget, and consequently, tax policy.

What would I want to focus attention on? The republics came to the united opinion—true, after considerable quarrels—that for the Union to be an economically sovereign state, union property is essential. All the participants in the talks agreed with this, although doubt was expressed at the preceding stages as to the need for this. There was even a proposal to exclude Union property as a concept entirely. Everything that is on the republics' territory is their own property, people said. There were also interim versions: The Union would afer all exercise powers of some kind, and a definite economic base, and, obviously, property, would be necessary for this.

It is natural that the functions of leadership of policy in the sphere of defense, at any rate, will be given to the Union, whatever the structure of the state may be. And that means that property connected with defense should be assigned to the Union. It should either belong to the Union directly, or should be considered the collective property of all the republics. The new version says that it is assigned on a treaty basis to the Union for the purpose of implementing the powers with which it is invested. In other words it is intended that some facilities located on the territories of the republics will be left in the Union's ownership.

[Yermakova] What are the other fundamental differences in the new draft?

[Tarazevich] For example, it was assumed in the first version that the USSR Constitution, its adoption and amendment, would all be entirely assigned to Union jurisdiction. Naturally, the intention was for the Constitution to be adopted by the Union Supreme Soviet or the Union Congress. In the new draft there is an entirely different proposal. Article 9 says that the USSR Constitution is adopted by a congress of representatives of the states participating in the treaty.

This means that the Union organs do not entrust the adoption of the Constitution to the supreme organs of the Union. I find their caution not entirely comprehensible. In this case the question of what sort of congress this is remains open. Perhaps it will be the congress which exists today? It too is a congress of the representatives of the republics. But then it would be called the Congress of People's Deputies. It will be necessary to specify, either in the addendum or in a separate document, what kind of congress this is, how its numbers will be made up, and how decisions will be adopted. I am sure there is no basis for this mistrust.

Another example—the organization of defense, leadership of the Armed Forces, the declaration of war, and the conclusion of peace formerly were entirely within the jurisdiction of the Union. In the new version the powers are shared. Organization of defense and leadership of the USSR Armed Forces, the Border Troops, the Internal Troops, and other troops, the declaration of war, and the conclusion of peace are the Union's prerogative. At the same time, the determination of USSR military policy is vested in joint powers.

There have been qualitatively new amendments also with regard to leadership of the industry which works for defense. Leadership of defense enterprises in the sphere of arms and military equipment production are the exclusive prerogative of the Union. But there is joint jurisdiction for production of civilian-purpose output.

It is important to note that the republics have come to a rational decision as regards the composition of the Union budget. In a number of regions, including Russia, the opinion was formerly stubbornly prevalent that the Union budget should be derived from the receipt of fixed sums from the republic budgets. This is the so-called one-channel system—it is enshrined even in the Shatalin program. In other words, tax and tax policy are determined in the localities: All taxes on producers, enterprises, organizations, and citizens go into the republics' budgets, and they "donate" some part of this into the Union budget. It is quite obvious that this system is unreliable with regard to a Union state, and consequently does not facilitate the creation of a reliable basis for the new Union. Everyone agreed that Union taxes and duties would be established, which would in effect constitute the Union budget. True, the size of these taxes and duties will be determined by agreement with the republics.

[Yermakova] So agreement has been reached on the main questions, and the draft can be considered to have entered the "home stretch"?

[Tarazevich] Unfortunately I cannot be optimistic. I think that it is too early yet to talk about the finishing post being in sight. However, the results of the referendum will influence the acceleration of the process because, after all, an overwhelming majority of the people voted for a Union on the principles of federalism. And therefore, I think, the influence of separatist tendencies, the forces which are endeavoring to somehow dismember the Union, will be reduced. This is the Union treaty's great asset, and it illuminates the goal which we are aiming for.

The most difficult process lies ahead—examination of the draft by the Union republic parliaments, to which it has been sent by the Federation Council. There its discussion will depend on various factors, in particular on the timetable of the sessions. I hope that the Federation Council, the USSR president, and the Union parliament will help bring the date of the examination of the draft closer. But the examination will, of course, be exceptionally difficult in itself. New amendments and disagreements are possible.

[Yermakova] But could this process go on indefinitely?

[Tarazevich] At the present time the process is being guided by the drafting committee, which includes top officials from the republics, headed by the USSR president. It is they who to all intents and purposes are to determine the subsequent procedure. At the Federation Council session there was already talk of what should happen next and what should be the mechanism for reaching agreement on the disagreements which will emerge after the draft is examined in the localities.

Allow me also to note that the role of representatives of the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Federation Council, who are attending the treaty process, is passive: We can only explain and consult. After all, someone has to represent all-Union interests in the talks. In the Federation Council and the drafting committee this function is fulfilled, of course, by the president. But when the talks take place? No one has the authority to take an active stance from the viewpoint of all-Union, nationwide interests. But after all, the Union is a reality today.

And the last question: How is the draft signing process to be organized? How many republics can be the initial signatories, so to speak? For instance, I believe that if some republics are agreed—above all, Russia, of course—the signing process can begin. Because even as regards the republics which participated in the drafting process, complete agreement may not be reached at once—disagreements over the draft may emerge in the parliaments.

But if some republics are united with Russia, then the draft can be signed. The remaining difficulties can be removed later. A mechanism must be worked our for all this.

All-Russian Television Debuts 13 May

LD1305080491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 0656 GMT 13 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 13 May (TASS)—The first broadcast of the All-Russian State Television and Radio Company goes on the air today at 1700 [as received] [1400 GMT]. The company's managing director, Anatoliy Lysenko, says that in spite of a vast number of problems, Russian Television will be screened on the Second Program from 1130 to 1330 [0830-1030 GMT] and from 1700 to 1900 [1400-1600 GMT], with a third block of programs going out after the "Vremya" program and the relay of the parliamentary session, that is to say about 2300 [2000 GMT]. [According to a program preview broadcast by Moscow Central Television Second Program at the end of the 12 May broadcast day, Russian Television will begin broadcasting at 1030 GMT 13 May.]

TV, Radio Agency Director Outlines Goals

LD0905164291 Moscow World Service in English 0000 GMT 9 May 91

[Excerpts] And Now, attention: (Astra), a new Soviet television and radio agency with great prospects and unique possibilities. (Astra) includes Radio Moscow World Service in English beaming broadcasts to countries in five continents. (Astra) is the World Service in Russian. (Astra) produces programming for Soviet national television. (Astra) can advertise your company, name, and business to millions in this country and abroad. Call (Astra) at 2336248, Fax 2336973, Telex 411137 Radio SU. Remember the name—(Astra), your choice for success.

And next in our studio is the general director of (Astra), (Armen Oganesyan), with some explanations of the advertisement you've just heard.

[(Oganesyan)] [passage omitted] This company is within Gosteleradio. It was set [as heard] in autumn last year, and having a rather big radio wing of World Service in English and in Russian, we also have an ambition to become a Soviet company which will explore a new satellite channel, (Moscow Global) to produce television stuff—filming on cultural matters, education, informative programs—on this big channel, which actually covers with its signal whole world [as heard]. I think that technically (Moscow Global) is even bigger than what CNN has in its disposal. So it's international television also, I mean, (Astra). In this direction, in this dimension of its activities, the company is doing its first steps, I would say. We have, on the first Soviet channel, we have shown our first film, and in May this year we are to start regular broadcasting on the first national channel, because we think just to work for (Moscow Global) for our foreign audience and for Soviet people or Russian-speaking people abroad is not enough. After all, journalists, you know, they have this desire to see their faces just on the screen, the more so that journalists who are coming to work for (Astra) are, some of them, are very famous journalists inside the Soviet Union. So (Astra) now is also television with big ambitions and we hope, we hope very soon to become a factor of world of information and we are very keen, we are very keen to work hard in this direction. Thank you.

[Reporter] Thank you, (Armen). I think that our listeners will now really remember the name of the new television and radio agency to which Radio Moscow now belongs as one of its divisions.

Media Festival Marked by 'Heated Exchange'

LD1105160391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1310 GMT 11 May 91

[Report by correspondent Sergey Belyayev on the "festival of the independent democratic press" entitled "A Step on the Way" in Moscow on 11 May]

[Excerpt] Hello, respected listeners. Right at the entrance to the park—where there is a banner reading: A free Press for Free People—signatures were being collected for a document regarding the necessity of holding a referendum on the matter of nationalizing CPSU property. There was quite a number of people eager to sign this document, just as there was no shortage of people to put their names on a document in favor of Boris Yeltsin's candidacy for the post of Russian president.

The festival began at midday with its own particular extraordinary editorial meeting. Representatives of the most varied democratic and independent publishing houses addressed those assembled. Sergey Stankevich, deputy chairman of the Moscow City Soviet, also spoke. He said that Russia is now on the way to being reborn, and the democratic press is assisting this greatly. When Igor Tolkov provided music for the ears of the respected public, quite a scene took place behind the stage.

Vladimir Zhirinovskiy, leader of the Liberal-Democratic Party, made his political protest to Sergey Stankevich, the representative of the city authorities, in a very stormy way. Zhirinovskiy was very unhappy about the fact that no one on the stage made any mention of the LIBERAL newspaper, the paper of the Liberal-Democratic Party, being involved in the festival. At this, Stankevich noted that this protest was being made to the wrong person as the Moscow City Soviet is not organizing the festival. The heated exchange of words went on for some time, and a large crowd of curious onlookers assembled. It was to these very same curious people that Zhirinovskiy began to speak of his right to express his protest on any subject whatsoever. On hearing this, one man said: You are not going to be the Russian president. He then hid in the crowd. [passage omitted]

Pozner Explains Departure From TV Post

PM1005135991 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 7 May 91 p 2

[Vladimir Pozner article: "Big Company's Little Secret. Why a Popular Political Observer Left Central Television"]

[Text] Some time ago a woman came up to me in the street.

"You are Vladimir Pozner," she said in a tone that was more a statement than a question.

"That's right," I replied.

"I think you should know that you have offended me," she continued.

I was about to object and say that I was very sorry if I had offended her in some way and that you cannot please everyone. However, without even giving me time to open my mouth, the woman said:

"You have offended the people."

I must confess, I wanted to say something sarcastic about the way she was venturing to speak on behalf of the people, but once again the woman was too quick for me:

"Is it true that you have left?"

It was then that I realized what she was talking about. The first reports that I was leaving the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company and moving to the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company appeared in the press some two weeks before I actually left. These reports were based on rumors: In any case, no one from the MOSKOVSKIY KOMSOMOLETS, VECHERNYAYA MOSKVA, or KURANTY editorial offices consulted me. As a result, the information about my move to the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company was incorrect, to put it mildly: I had not moved anywhere. Moreover, these unexplained reports have given cause for all kinds of interpretations and even—as the words of the woman mentioned above confirm—offense.

This article is an attempt to introduce clarity, answer all the questions, and put an end to rumors and gossip.

I would like to start by giving the main "landmarks" in my life as a journalist, as I feel that information will shed some light on my professional genesis, so to speak. So:

October 1961-February 1970. Worked for NOVOSTI and the Novosti Publishing House, including as senior secretary of the journals SOVIET LIFE (this publication is circulated in the United States in exchange for the journal AMERICA) and SPUTNIK.

February 1970-July 1986. Commentator with the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting [Gosteleradio] Radio Broadcasting to the United States and Britain Main Editorial Desk (this institution has now changed its name, but I use the one by which it is best known).

July 1986-14 April 1991. Political observer for USSR Gosteleradio.

This list makes it clear that 25 years of my life as a journalist have been devoted to working for foreign readers and listeners—and only five years to working for a Soviet audience. Everything I am about to say is concerned with this extremely important five-year period in my professional life.

When I made my real television debut on Central Television's First Program with the Leningrad-Seattle television linkup (until then I had only appeared occasionally), Aleksandr Nikiforovich Aksenov was chairman of Gosteleradio. He had taken up this post not long before and had been appointed in the way that all state committee chairmen and ministers were appointed at the time: officially by the USSR Council of Ministers but in reality by a CPSU Central Committee Politburo decision. The consent of all the Politburo members was required for such an appointment, which in particular reflected the principle of collective leadership.

When, three years later, A.N. Aksenov was replaced as chairman by Mikhail Fedorovich Nenashev, the appointment procedure was different and accorded with generally accepted international norms: The nomination of a future member of government was made by the chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, and the Supreme Soviet could either approve or reject this nomination.

However, I wonder whether readers remember the USSR presidential decrees on releasing M.F. Nenashev from his duties, reappointing him to his old position as chairman of the State Committee for the Press, and appointing Leonid Petrovich Kravchenko the new chairman of Gosteleradio? If not, I shall remind you.

Nenashev was released from his duties in connection with his transfer to other work; the decree said that his appointment was subject to approval by the USSR Supreme Soviet. However, the decree on L.P. Kravchenko's appointment made no such stipulation: He had been appointed—and that was the end of the matter. The Supreme Soviet's approval was not required. How and why the Supreme Soviet went along with this is a subject for another article. It is important to remember this in this particular case in order to understand—albeit retrospectively—the objective that was being pursued. That objective was to turn a state committee, i.e. a government body, into a state company, i.e. a nongovernment formation. In this case, the head of the company was being removed from the Cabinet of Ministers and his appointment was not subject to confirmation by the Supreme Soviet. He had been confirmed in his position by just one man: the president of the USSR.

Thus something without precedent in the world came into being: presidential television and radio.

When, on becoming chairman of what was then Gosteleradio, L.P. Kravchenko said "I have come to do the president's will," he was being absolutely frank and honest. And when a little later he said that he would not allow anyone to criticize the USSR president, his policies, or his government, he was simply living up to his promise.

And when Leonid Petrovich—admittedly not without some hesitation prompted by my departure from the CPSU and some of my public statements on events taking place in the country—offered me the highest creative office of first-category political observer with the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company, he quite sincerely told me to play by these new rules.

And they were new rules—at least as far as I was concerned—because criticism had not been banned under either A.N. Aksenov or M.F. Nenashev. However—it is extremely important to understand this—the issue has nothing to do with either Aksenov, Nenashev, or Kravchenko. The new rules of the game are to do with television and radio being transformed into a mouthpiece for presidential power, i.e. a change of policy.

I refused to play by these rules because I decided that if I were to agree in advance not to criticize authority, I would cease to be a journalist (in the sense in which I understand the nature of the profession, of course). That is the first and main reason why I left.

There are also other reasons: in particular, solidarity with colleagues who have been given short shrift, essentially because of dissent; and protest against the appointment to top creative and administrative posts of a number of people who, in my view, are unsuitable, as they do not meet either of the criteria which L.P. Kravchenko has repeatedly told us will be the deciding factors in his selection of future staffers of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company: professionalism and integrity.

I repeat: These factors played a role in my decision but were not crucial to it.

Obviously, I should also answer the question of why I did not move to the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company, despite having the opportunity to do so. The answer is simple: Because of the inevitability of it becoming something similar to what I felt I had to leave.

We are all following the Russian parliament's long, hard struggle for television and radio time. I think most of us sympathize with this struggle, and the harder it is, the more we sympathize. But, while passionately desiring victory, it seems to me that we are forgetting an extremely important consideration: This struggle will end not only with Russian television "breaking through" to the airwaves but also with the appearance of another state television company. By virtue of this circumstance, it is bound to become a carbon copy of the television company which so many intelligent journalists and other professionals have fled or been forced to leave. I would like to stress once again that, however liberal and critical leaders may be, they cannot substantially influence the laws by which a structure or organism operates. A state organism is a self-contained structure, and even the most "well-meaning" of leaders can do nothing about this.

Of course, the government is within its rights to have its own television and radio mouthpiece. Although, strictly speaking, it should be no less interested in the existence of television and radio independent of it. Why? Because it is from independent sources that the government can obtain information about its own blunders and errors and the prevailing mood in society. Loyalist coverage of events, albeit pleasant to the authorities, at best does no good and at worst does harm. It lulls people. Information from an independent source that no one has dressed up to look good allows one to take a sober view of the world and oneself and, if necessary, make changes.

Perhaps the Russian leadership headed by B.N. Yeltsin will abolish the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company's state status, demolish it as a structure, and create an independent Russian television and radio company before it has time to become established, ossified, and nothing more than a Russian version of the all-Union company? That would be a vital, significant step in the direction of real democracy and real freedom of speech.

One last point.

My departure from the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company and nonarrival at the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company certainly does not signify a desire on my part to disappear from the television screens. Quite the reverse. An accord on future cooperation has been reached in principle with the chairman of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company (pertaining to the Moscow channel in particular), and a firm agreement has been reached with the director of the Russian State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company that I will be involved in future broadcasts. But if it should happen—and, as we all know, anything or almost anything can happen—that these accords are broken or for some reason left unimplemented, if I should indeed disappear from the television screens, I would like the viewer—who has always supported me and placed amazing trust in me—to bear the following in mind:

Do not believe that someone who leaves television is thereby revealing his indifference to you. Do not believe that an artist who boycotts television is in fact boycotting you because he is depriving you of the opportunity to see his work. Do not believe that the miners who go on strike are striking against the people because, by their action, they are complicating an already difficult economic situation. Even if others have a very strong desire to persuade you of this, do not believe it.

The miners are striking for our sake, so that one day we can start living like human beings; they are setting an example of awareness and selflessness. It would be easier not to go on strike. It would be better to receive some money than none at all.

People in the arts world who boycott television are trying to defend the individual's inalienable right to obtain reliable information and to express their solidarity with journalists who have lost their jobs and been persecuted. It would be simpler not to boycott. It would be simpler to bask in the rays of television fame than to languish in the shadows.

As someone who has worked 21 years in radio and television but has only had the opportunity to speak to his fellow citizens from the television screen for just over five years, it would also be a great deal easier for me to accept the flattering offer made to me by the leadership of the All-Union State Television and Radio Broadcasting Company. As far as the reasons for my turning down this offer and subsequently leaving are concerned, I hope they are now extremely clear.

Commentator Views Gorbachev's 'Centrist' Position

LD0905154891 Moscow World Service in English 1210 GMT 9 May 91

[Vitaliy Gurov commentary]

[Excerpts] The complicated political situation in the Soviet Union and its instability remain, as before, number one topics in Western media comments. And how is the situation seen from Moscow? Vitaliy Gurov elaborates, and this is what he writes:

First of all I'd like to join many of my colleagues who assess various aspects of life in Soviet society in more than one way. Problems have landed on us like an avalanche: the economic crisis, interethnic conflicts, and political clashes. The main question that arouses concern of most observers here is what is awaiting us? What direction will the economic development take? Will the authorities go on with political reforms leading to a further democratization? Or will these reforms be put in reverse? [passage omitted]

President Gorbachev has managed to take advantage of the situation at a time when both the right and the left wings are sacred by the advance of their opponents. The left wing is concerned about the noticeable invigoration of the activities by the Soyuz grouping linked with the radical and conservative forces in Soviet society including orthodox communists. The right wing has probably felt for the first time the power and effectiveness of strikes. They are gathering momentum not only in coalmining areas, but in Belorussia, obedient up till recently. As for the radical groups forming the Democratic Russia movement, they take an uncompromised stand.

In this explosion-prone situation Mikhail Gorbachev has managed to rally around himself the presidents of nine Union republics who seem to stand on polarized positions only recently. [sentence as heard] I am sure they were brought together not only by the realization of the dangerous situation in the country, but also by the purposeful strictly centrist position of the Soviet president. Lying at its core is the desire to ensure conditions for profound transformations, prevent a social breakdown and maintain the dynamic nature of the processes within the framework of democracy and reforms.

During his meeting with the chairman of the News Corporation, Rupert Murdoch, Mikhail Gorbachev reaffirmed that no alteration of the course was expected in the life of the Soviet Union. The general political choice will not change. The president is sure that the country's transition into a new state would be inevitably accompanied by elements of chaos. But their suppression by methods which are, say, 10 years old, would mean for the country not just a simple return to the past state, it would doom democracy rising into being in this country and the growing self-consciousness of people of various nationalities.

In short, there would be no choice of a new political course. But when policy in the Soviet Union makes no headway this can't help but arouse bewilderment and incomprehension.

'Top Priority' Program Views Communist Party

LD0605132191 Moscow World Service in English 2300 GMT 5 May 91

["Top Priority" program hosted by Irina Tkachenko, with Andrey Kortunov, from the Institute for U.S. and Canada Studies; and Aleksey Kireyev, economic adviser to the CPSU Central Committee]

[Excerpts] [Tkachenko] Welcome to "Top Priority". I'm Irina Tkachenko and I welcome at the studios of Radio Moscow Andrey Kortunov, an expert from the Institute for U.S. and Canada Studies here in Moscow, and Aleksey Kireyev, an economic adviser to the Communist Party's Central Committee.

Soviet papers these days, discussing politics in this country, don't sound like they trust anyone. Rather like a game of poker where you never know if anyone around you is bluffing or not, politics as such in this country looks like a gamble. It's unclear who is running the country and much less so who may win in the long run.

My first question is: Who do you think controls the situation? Is it the central authorities that are criticized left, right, and center; the Communist Party that some people say has discredited itself beyond repair; or probably the Democrats, who are also losing out because of inner conflicts and bickering? Andrey?

[Kortunov] Well, I don't think it would be fair to speak about political groupings that are controlling the country. It would be probably more accurate to speak about institutions that are in charge of different sectors of our public life and economic life, and here, of course, I think we can speak about a couple of such institutions. First of all, still the state bureaucracy is very powerful and I think that it exercises a kind of control over the routine economic decisions taken in the center and in the periphery of the country.

Second, I think that still a very powerful force is the military industries which have their own system of priorities, which have their own system of decision-making, and I think that they are still able to control a large share of the country's economy.

Then I wouldn't discard such powerful bodies as the military and the security agencies which seem to increase their influence on the decision making, especially in the center. And finally, of course, we are now witnessing the growing power of the republican authorities, specifically, I think, the Russian Federation Government is becoming more active. [passage omitted]

One can see that our top leadership is highly inconsistent in its economic programs. For example, take the case of the defense budget. I think it's rather shocking that at a time like that our military budget has grown up to almost 100 billion rubles within one year. This year (?only) the military budget grew from 26 percent of the federal budget up to 36 percent. I think it's something—it shows that this government does not have a very comprehensive and practical system of priorities. [passage omitted]

[Tkachenko] To a considerable extent, how Mikhail Gorbachev is perceived at the grass roots level depends on his standing in the Communist Party. Aleksey, would you say that the Soviet president is now widely unpopular within the Communist Party apparatus, within the Communist Party structure? After all, we've seen at the recent plenary meeting of the Communist Party, the party leaders are dissatisfied with either his policy inside the country or abroad.

[Kireyev] By the way, what Communist Party do you mean? I cannot say that there is a very huge split within the Communist Party but there are different movements, different opinions, different approaches to the same problem. We should precise first of all what Communist Party do we mean?

If we mean—or maybe we can say—[the] right-wing of the Communist Party, those representatives of local party authorities who cannot get rid of the idea that they are (?chiefs) on their local territory, of course Gorbachev is not very popular among them.

If you take into consideration that within the Central, even the Central Committee of the Communist Party there are a lot of young people now—like me, for example; I'm only 30 now—there is quite a different opinion about Gorbachev within this strata of people. If we see that there are also a very big army, let's put it like that, of members of the Communist Party who is working in the defense plants, and who is undergoing conversion now. Of course, they cannot be satisfied with Gorbachev's efforts to reduce [the] military budget.

Of course, there are quite different approaches, and as far as I know, during the last plenum of the Communist Party Central Committee there were very huge discussions between different approaches, different opinions, and different assessments of the real status of the general secretary within the party and within the country. But I think that if (?just) Gorbachev decides to leave his post as the general secretary of the Communist Party, that will be very harmful for the whole country right now. Maybe in some months or even years that will be okay, alright, but now it will be very harmful for the whole country.

[Tkachenko] Andrey, would you agree with this view that it will deal a major blow to the country's well being at the moment if Gorbachev resigns as general secretary of the Communist Party?

[Kortunov] Well, as an outsider I might underestimate the real power of the Communist Party—probably it still has some abilities to overcome its present crisis, I don't know. But for me personally, it seems that some kind of a split within the party is practically inevitable because this party is not able to control the whole constituency it used to control and I think that...

[Kireyev, interrupting] But it should not control, that is the problem! Why (?don't you lose) the control?

[Kortunov] I mean that the party should find its new social and political base and my feeling is that the natural social and political base for the Communist Party will be the strata of the population which are the most, the privileged, and which will suffer mostly from the economy reform. Like it happens now in the countries of eastern Europe—I think that in all the countries of eastern Europe, communists or democratic socialist, or whoever they are, are able to control about 10 or 15 percent of the population—the people who are misfits and outcasts of the current economic changes in the eastern Europe. And I think that if our Communist leaders, if they're smart enough, they should rely on these people and they should try to channel their frustrations and their disappointments into constitutional political process.

On the other hand, I do believe that we have some potential for [a] liberal social democratic party which will differ quite a lot from the party which is represented by people like Polozkov. And I think it would be just very positive to have, let us say, three or four major political parties. [passage omitted]

I think that these four parties can create a kind of political stability in the country because otherwise our democracy will degenerate into a rally democracy, into [a] meeting democracy and we'll have continuation of the paralysis in the Supreme Soviet. We need a solid party structure and I think that Communist Party, if it splits, can give birth to a couple of parties which will compete with each other, compete with other new forces and create larger stability in the society. [passage omitted]

Economic

Pavlov Expects More Freedom in Choosing Markets

LD1205215291 Hamburg DPA in German 1016 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Moscow (DPA)—The USSR intends to give enterprises more freedom when trading at home and abroad before the end of the year. USSR Prime Minister Valentin Pavlov said this in an interview with the INTERFAX news agency, published today. "We plan to allow enterprises throughout the Union to go to the markets independently and decide whether they sell products at home or abroad," Pavlov said. Currently, state guidelines limit most enterprises in their dealings.

Discussing his government's anticrisis program, Pavlov said: "We were pressured by time and were fully aware that this program is not ideal by a long shot." Nonetheless, it is a joint product of the Soviet Government and the leadership of the republics. The program to stabilize the economy, which will be presented to the cabinet on 15 May for examination, foresees reduced state expenditures and increased privatization. It was approved by the Soviet legislature in April.

Vorkuta Miners Suspend Strike, Resume Operations

LD1205171191 Moscow TASS in English 1700 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov]

[Text] Vorkuta May 12 TASS—All mines in the Soviet Vorkuta Arctic area today suspended a strike and resumed regular operations.

But production was much less than before the stoppage, which at some pits had continued for more than two months, as its effects made their impact. The tunnel driving total, for example, was under 7,000 metres, limiting the scope of work for coal cutting teams.

Experts predict that nullifying the effects of the walkout will take months.

The material and financial losses of the area's mines from the strike left both miners and their city in a difficult position.

Spokesmen for the Vorkuta city strike committee told TASS that the Russian Federation of Independent Trade Unions had allocated 41 million roubles in social aid to local people.

Coal Extraction Resumed

LD1005170491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1558 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Makarov]

[Text] Vorkuta (Komi SSR), 10 May—The overwhelming majority of miners' collectives of this polar town suspended the strike today according to the decision of the Vorkuta town workers' strike committee. Of 13 mines in Vorkuta, only the "Oktyabrskaya" mine is idle. The collective demands the reelection of the director. Some miners of the "Severnaya" mine and the "Yur-Shor" were also on strike today, although they resumed coal extraction.

The Vorkuta miners strike was suspended in connection with the transfer of local coal industry enterprises to the jurisdiction of government bodies of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic. The consequences of the current strike are also very grave for Vorkuta citizens themselves. The "Vorkutaugol" association failed to extract over 1.2 million tonnes of fuel because of the strike. A total of 900,000 tonnes of coal were undersupplied to consumers. It will be extremely difficult to resume the previous rate of coal extraction.

One Mine Still Not Working in Kuzbass

LD1205084691 Moscow All-Union Radio Mayak Network in Russian 0700 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Kemerovo—After the suspension of strike, the pace of extracting coal and shipping it to customers is being increased by the miners of Kuzbass. Today, from the spur tracks of the pits and open-cast mines of Kuznetsk coalfield, 2,200 truckloads of coal more than in the days of strike has been sent to metal workers and power engineering workers. From over 100 coal-extracting enterprises, only one mine is still not working, TASS reports.

Military

Yazov Approves Creation of Cossack Units

LD1005152291 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1300 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] The Don military-historical club has proposed creating Cossack formations in the Soviet Army. In particular it is expected to restore Cossack military names and to change the text of the oath in that section where there are references to the Communist Party. As reported by the POSTFAKTUM agency, Vladimir Popov, chief of the Rostov Cossack district, stated that according to data available to the Cossacks, USSR Defense Minister Dmitriy Yazov has approved the idea of creating Cossack units.

Volkogonov Denies Plans for Russian Army

PM1005072491 Paris LE MONDE in French 9 May 91 p 2

[Dominique Dhombres report: "Will a Pacifist General Be the Future Russian Defense Minister"]

[Text] Moscow—The Russian Federation building—a white marble skyscraper that is already old but that has not aged too badly—has great style from the outside. It is here that Boris Yeltsin has installed his offices. General Dmitriy Volkogonov, Mr. Yeltsin's military adviser, welcomed us with a great show of protocol, as befits a retired high-ranking officer who served at a time when the Soviet Army was one of the country's most respected forces. Deputy Volkogonov, since he prefers his civilian title to be used, or, better still, Professor Volkogonov (he did a history thesis) is rather a mysterious figure. How can a man who has believed all his life in discipline which is, as everybody knows, the main strength of the Armed Forces, sit in this building in which a committee of striking miners was chattering in the corridors near his office?

The answer is not easy, but he wanted, above all, to remove a doubt. "We do not want a Russian army," he immediately explained. His plan is both more modest and more ambitious. He sees his role as that of a spur to force the Soviet Army, the only one that can defend the country, to be both more efficient and more democratic. A Russian army? Rubbish! Who would be its hypothetical enemy? The Soviet Army? That would be the "first step toward civil war." NATO? Not NATO either. In the course of the conversation, you realize that Gen. Volkogonov has virtually become a pacifist.

He does not believe—if he ever did—in nuclear deterrence. He wants to eliminate nuclear weapons, whichever country they belong to, as soon as possible. Does Mr. Gorbachev say the same thing? Yes. After all, Mr. Gorbachev too sometimes has good ideas.... Is he not Boris Yeltsin's enemy. Not at all, that is a misunderstanding. Mikhail Gorbachev and Boris Yeltsin are like Siamese twins, one cannot exist without the other, they could only be separated by a painful surgical operation. That could only be done by undemocratic forces....

Why have nuclear weapons become obsolete? Because nobody seriously believes they will be used. Gen. Volkogonov discussed that when he visited Paris. The French military listened to him politely but were not convinced. He had a little more success at the Sorbonne....

He used a powerful image: All the inhabitants of our planet are like passengers on a spaceship; they will not be crazy enough to destroy the vessel itself. He thinks that politics in our age should be based on this "global thinking." He prefers this expression to that of "new thinking" dear to Mr. Gorbachev.

In short, the road to denuclearization has been opened, and we must continue in that direction. For instance, if the U.S. and Soviet nuclear potential is reduced by 50 percent, and that is not impossible, the French and British will have to make a gesture too. Mr. Volkogonov did not want to give figures about the "reduction" which France would then be asked to make. He left that to the experts.

The basis of his argument is that "Russia is not threatened from any side." The United States, France, reunified Germany, and NATO in general have "no intention" of attacking it. It is therefore necessary to tackle the real problem that is that of drawing up a proper conventional defense system. That should be based on the observation that two-thirds of the Soviet Army's funding come from the Russian Federation.

The vast majority of the Soviet Army command is Slav (Russian, Belorussian, or Ukrainian). That is a "bad thing," but it is difficult to remedy it in the short term. Military service, which is two years in the Army, could be maintained in its present form. If an alternative service was set up, for instance for young people to want to be useful to society in different ways, it would have to be a little longer, a few months for instance, to prevent the temptation being too strong.

These are some of Mr. Volkogonov's ideas and convictions. If Mr. Yeltsin is elected Russian president by universal suffrage on 12 June, Professor Volkogonov could well become a kind of "defense minister" in the new Russian executive.

Army Recruitment Problems Reported in Leningrad

LD1105211191 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1515 GMT 11 May 91

[Statement by Major-General Anatoliy Yakovlevich Obukhov; From the "I Serve the Soviet Union" Program produced by the Radio and Television Creative Production Association RADAR, hosted by Petr Pelekhov; place and date not given—recorded]

[Text] The next feature in the RADAR program deals with a subject that is particularly topical now that spring is here. I am talking about the latest military call-up. As you know, in many places it is not proceeding as it should. This applies not just to the Transcaucasus or the Baltic region. Even in Leningrad, where until recently, arrangements for the call-up were among the best in the country, the response to the draft has led not just to concern but to alarm. Here is what Major-General Anatoliy Yakovlevich Obukhov, military commissar of the city of Leningrad, told our correspondent Matvey Frolov.

[Begin Obukhov recording] I think we have forgotten all about education, especially the patriotic education of our people, above all the younger generation. Although a law on universal military service is on the statute books, and this law is in force, leaders of enterprises are refusing to carry out this law. Leaders of municipal and housing authorities are refusing to comply with it. As a result, the call-up in Leningrad is not going at all well, and is sometimes breaking down altogether. Last year was the first year that Leningrad failed to meet the target it set for providing young recruits for military service. Only 65 percent of those eligible for call-up actually set off for units.

Why is the situation so critical? First, we have now begun to experience a very great shrinkage in the pool of man power from which to draw recruits. The USSR Supreme Soviet adopted a decision that allows students to defer their military service. In doing so, it undermined the whole point of the law on universal military service and greatly restricted our room for maneuver. For instance, in autumn 1990, 21,000 of the 27,000 draftees who were supposed to be called up into the Army were allowed to defer their service, because they were taking educational courses.

For the last three to four years there has been very clear evidence that the health of young people in the city is deteriorating. Judge for yourself. In 1988, 3,000 young people were deemed unfit for military service on health grounds. In 1990 this increased to 4,500. Although call-up commissions have only been at work for a month so far this year, the signs are that this trend is increasing. During the first month of the call-up, about 16 percent of all young people were found to be unfit for Army service. All medical services for adolescents in the city have been neglected. They have virtually ceased to exist. With the switch to financial autonomy, Leningrad occupies 74th place in Russia for the standard of its medical care.

Strange as it may seem, the general educational standard of young people is falling to catastrophic levels in our city. In 1988 only 2.2 percent of all draftees failed to complete secondary education. In 1990 this increased sixfold, and this is in the Hero-City of Leningrad, where a revolution was staged to ensure that universal secondary education would be mandatory. A law on this was adopted. Unfortunately, the general educational level of young people is falling.

There is a fourth problem that has an extremely negative impact on the entire combat readiness of our units. This is the complicated crime situation among young people. Last year one in four draftees had been taken into police custody at some time or other. The situation has not changed since then. Some 20-25 percent of our draftees have a police record. Last year over 500 young people called up into the Army had a criminal record. We have already reached the same figure for the number taken into police custody this year, even though we have only been at work for a month.

Unfortunately, the city's military recruitment offices have been left to cope with many of these problems on their own. In other words, we are tackling a problem which afflicts the entire country, but without any outside help. Decisions have been issued by the Executive Committee of the Leningrad Soviet. Similar decisions have been taken in all districts; however, specific work to implement these decisions is lacking. The officials who refuse to implement the law, who refuse to implement decisions passed by the soviets and executive committees, are not being brought to book. Unfortunately, this work is being carried in a formalistic way.

Article 32 in the law says that local authorities should organize ceremonies to see off draftees who are going to serve in the Army. Unfortunately, they are refusing to do this in many districts. For instance, call-up day arrived in Krasnoselskiy Rayon but not a single representative of the local authorities bothered to show up, even though the law stipulates that such ceremonies should be arranged and supervized by the soviet or executive committee.

Most of the draftees who leave Leningrad to serve in the Army serve well. Our Military Commissariat has not yet received a single complaint from a unit commander that one of our draftees has been convicted for committing some offense, or that any of them are serving badly. We receive many grateful letters, and we also make our own enquiries. We get letters from the Navy, from the Border Troops. This just shows that conscripts from Leningrad set their own high standard. [end recording]

Last Warship Built at Leningrad Shipworks

LD0805223991 Moscow World Service in English 2000 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] The last warship built at orders from the Soviet Navy has been launched at Almaz shipyards in Leningrad. Under the conversion program the company has switched to the manufacture of civilian goods, sports boats, yachts, and ships for environmental monitoring. The air cushion landing ships it used to produce are given over to geologists and rescue services. The company has taken the first steps to the world market and signed contracts with a British firm for the construction of hulls for cruising yachts.

Baltic Republics

Lithuanian Delegation on Delay in USSR Talks

LD1105145291 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] The Lithuanian Republic state delegation for interstate negotiations with the Soviet Union has published the following statement:

An agreement was reached at the third official working meeting between the Lithuanian Republic and the Soviet Union in Moscow on 4 April, 1991, that the next official meeting between the delegations would take place at the end of April or the beginning of May of this year.

At this meeting between delegations, confirmation was made of the subjects to be included in future negotiations, within the 11 groups of experts, and it was also decided that the coordination of the expert groups as well as holding meetings of the official delegations would be the concern of a joint work group, yet to be established.

The countries will have to define the composition of the expert group and their leaders and inform one another of these, prior to the next official delegation meeting.

The groups of experts were to have started their work back in April and the joint working group was supposed to be preparing for the upcoming joing delegation meeting.

Although the second 10-day period of May has already begun, not a single one of the aforementioned agreements is being carried out, and the Soviet Union's procrastination is the reason behind this.

On 10 May, therefore, Ceslovas Stankevicius, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, sent a telegram to Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, first deputy prime minister of the Soviet Union and head of the Soviet delegation, in which concern is expressed over the lack of progress in negotiation preparations.

Regret is expressed over the fact that agreements are not being carried out, that neither the site nor the time of the next meeting have been appointed, and that so far no success has been attained in establishing contacts, either with him, or with other authorized individuals of the Soviet delegation, in spite of the fact that many attempts have been made to reach them.

The telegram requests that leaders of the expert groups and the joint work group are appointed and that they will be permitted to begin work.

The telegram also expresses great concern over the failure to receive any reply so far to the often-repeated requests by the Republic of Lithuania for the return of the state buildings in Lithuania, [word indistinct] by the Soviet military.

The opinion is being expressed that the solution to this question has vital significance in strengthening mutual trust on the eve of future negotiations. It is hoped that an affirmative reply will be received in the near future.

Bickauskas Calls For USSR Policy Statement

PM1305080391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[BALTFAX report from the "IZVESTIYA, TASS, RIA, INTERFAX, URAL-AKTSEPT, REUTERS, IAN" column: "Call by Lithuanian Permanent Representative"]

[Text] In an interview with the newspaper LIETUVOS RYTAS Egidijus Bickauskas, the Lithuanian Government representative in Moscow, has criticized Lithuania's current foreign policy vis-a-vis the USSR and called for the preparation of a policy document that would set out the main landmarks for Soviet-Lithuanian relations for the next 5-10 years. Such a comprehensive document would, in Bickauskas' opinion, rule out any kind of speculation on the Soviet Union's part. "In this event both the West and most Soviet citizens would have a clearer idea of mutual claims and the reasons behind them," BALTFAX reports.

Lithuanian Draft Constitution Published for Debate

LD1305092291 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1816 GMT 12 May 91

[Excerpts] Vilnius, 12 May (TASS)—The Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Presidium has published a "draft concept for a constitution of the Lithuanian Republic" so that it can be discussed in public. It has proposed that the republic's legislature form a commission to prepare a constitution.

The draft's first proposal reads: "The Lithuanian State is an independent, democratic republic." The territory of the Lithuanian Republic is declared to be "integral and indivisible" while the republic itself is a single (unitary) state. It is thought here that this clause was formulated to make it impossible to create a Polish autonomous area in the Vilnius region.

The draft includes a clause giving Lithuanian citizens the right "to oppose all who use violence to encroach on the sovereignty and integrity of the Lithuanian state."

State power should be held by a "democratically elected Sejm, the president of the republic, and the government, as well as by the court." It is typical that the powers and competence of the Sejm are significantly restricted and reduced compared with the current Supreme Soviet, while virtually unrestricted freedom of action is given to the president [passage omitted]

Only one draft has been officially presented for discussion. That is the one prepared by a commission headed by Vytautas Landsbergis, chairman of Lithuania's Supreme Soviet. It will be discussed until 1 August.

Lithuania's Motieka Queried on Current Issues

LD1105215191 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1300 GMT 10 May 91

[Interview with Kazimieras Motieka, deputy chairman of the Lithuanian Supreme Council, by correspondent Balys Urbonas in Vilnius—live]

[Excerpts] [passage omitted] [Motieka] Attempts are again being made to resurrect what was discussed at the USSR Supreme Soviet session—namely, the economic independence problems of Lithuania, Latvia, and Estonia. Currently it is already being said—well they negotiated approximately 60 percent of economic independence for us earlier—that by proceeding along that method, we could have somehow achieved something more, or to have struggled more successfully toward consolidation of our independence. Naturally, however, that is not being stated. For some reason, it is noted that we had obtained 60 percent of that independence, but further, one needs to include what that independence would provide for us and would it provide anything at all for Lithuania. [passage omitted]

They say that our government had to resign because of relations with the USSR. In other words, esteemed Prunskiene's government had to resign because of relations with the USSR. Also, they further explain that the price increases were imperative, without any further analysis, without any further comment. Well, we all know perfectly well, it was not because of the price increases. Prices had to be increased, but the Supreme Council decree was not carried out. As a result, the price increases had to be stopped, because of the existing situation in the republic, that chaos would arise and disturbances would erupt because of such price increases in Lithuania. This, however, was not taken into account. [passage omitted]

To state first of all, that this happened because of relations with the USSR—I beg your pardon! Relations are relations, and these relations are dependent on negotiations with the USSR. The USSR is avoiding negotiations. [passage omitted]

Of course, these negotiations have to being sooner or later; however, that does not all mean that we do not want these negotiations. We are seeking them and have always been demanding them by every means. We have even endured all sorts of humiliation. For instance, esteemed Stankevicius, leader of our delegation, has told us how much strength and endurance were required at the last meeting to listen to the USSR negotiation delegation members' reproaches directed against us, such as: What are you up to, spreading propaganda throughout the world? Not one of your people has been shot near the tower. They said: Not a single tank was there, yet you are spreading such propaganda. Imagine, they said: You collected dead bodies there from all over and then shot them when they were already dead. So what can you expect from that delegation, in general? Of course, it required a lot of effort and a great deal of willpower not to leave and slam the door. [passage omitted]

It is said that the mistakes after 11 March are constantly being rectified. These individuals represent the Future Forum—well, I for one, see nothing constructive to date. [passage omitted]

They say: There is no prepared long-term strategy of economic relations with the USSR. So, what are they talking about? What sort of strategy? Moreover, these representatives accuse us, presumably the Landsbergis-led legislature or leadership, of seeking to break off relations with the Soviet Union. In the meantime no such thing exists, and our strategic relations—strategic economic relations—are, especially so, being developed as equal rights relations with the USSR. Whether the Soviet Union wants this or not is a different question. Today it does not want this, because its aim is to have Lithuania stay within the structure of the Soviet Union. Not that it would remain, but the Soviet Union could enforce its jurisdiction on the Republic of Lithuania. As it is, since 11 March we are no longer within the Soviet Union. To say that we are refusing some artificial confrontation—there is nothing to refuse because there is no artificial confrontation with the Soviet Union. It is one thing that it is avoiding negotiations but that does not mean that there is a confrontation. That is one issue. [passage omitted]

As I have stated, however, we desire equal relations, economic relations of equal partnership, and we shall seek this. If they refuse, we will undoubtedly be forced to turn elsewhere, and I think that we are not alone and that there are many countries who are interested. Well then, immediately the opponents, will say—oh, we will have to pay in dollars. Nobody gives things away for nothing in the world. No one gives something for nothing. If the Soviet Union used to supply us previously, at reduced rates, we must not forget that we, too, used to give half [word indistinct] to the Soviet Union.

It is pointed out that privatization must be implemented in an evolutionary way, guaranteeing all human freedoms and rights. Well, that is beautiful—so what is different? Is the Landsbergis legislature of the Vagnorius government thinking differently? They are of the same opinion, and we struggling to that end, but look at how things are happening in life. [passage omitted]

Well, listen, does an individual have the right to regain his property or not? He has the right to do so. So why are demands made now to renounce that? Well then, go ahead and say we demand that the individual's right be restricted, namely in that area, and not to return their property to them. I do not know. No democratic country would ever understand such a thing, that we have decided not to return—that is, their property to the people. [passage omitted]

We are all people of one country, after all, we are from one Lithuania and are all aware of those tragedies. Thus, it seems to me that the consensus, or that accord among ourselves, should be total. The law must be prepared in such a way that it would provide guarantees of [word indistinct] for one side and the other. [passage omitted] Must the land be returned? Yes, it must be returned, wherever it is possible to return it to its owners. This is a basic principle of human rights and freedom, which must be guaranteed, by our laws, and we shall always strive toward this. Moreover, as far as the claim that it will set back agriculture, I will say this is a myth. [passage omitted] No one, not one of those, opponents of Landsbergis, if I may call them that, during meetings have even sought ways of getting out of this situation, so the rights of all people would be satisfied. You understand, but this is lacking. Here everything is being done only to criticize, to belittle, to demean—namely the current legislature—that it is acting totally inadequately. No one says anything about how they would do this, however—no one talks about that. [passage omitted]

Let us see who is doing the talking. They are not Sajudis—not members of the Sajudis legislative faction, if it can be called that, who go riding about on workdays, missing the Supreme Council sessions and do not deliberate the laws, but take people along by bus. In a word, they incite against the legislature. So who incited these people? [passage omitted]

This, in my opinion, is poison, dispersed downwind, to dupe normally minded people. Everyone is called toward unity, while this unity, which is desired by everyone, is being undermined. [words indistinct] I would say, it is one of many propaganda tricks, that are deliberately released by certain individuals for [word indistinct] into circulation. [passage omitted]

On the one hand the term "enemies" has resounded a great deal, while on the other hand I would like to say that if speaking of the conditions under which our Supreme Council, and also the government are working, then they must truly be referred to as extreme conditions.

First, I have in mind, we are under severe pressure from the Soviet Armed Forces and also its party apparatus structures, since we know there is yet an illegal organization in Lithuania—the so-called Burokevicius' Party and other units here that have nothing in common with our Lithuania. Well, on the other hand, we are also aware of the awful legacy of Stalin, when there existed only, so to speak, a mania of surveillance, informants and persecution of people. Now also, when the democratic forces are securing power in the East—in Russia—and when, at times even the KGB leaders join the stream of those forces—certain very high-ranking ones, even, well then they state very clearly, of approximately what caliber this surveillance apparatus is—and also the apparatus of all types of provocateurs, that exists.

Thus,' now we should be aware of the fact that this apparatus has not disintegrated and has not broken apart, in Lithuania, after all. [passage omitted]

Moreover, we have additional information from our structures that this apparatus is not only being expanded within, but also, KGB military forces are even being posted around it. This is one matter—the pressure against us, but on the other hand, all those informants, all those unofficial agents—they have not disappeared, after all. Following 11 March, the Supreme Council appealed to them to desist—to discontinue their activity and to cease fighting against Lithuania in that fashion. Perhaps, some of them acted accordingly, but the others certainly did not act accordingly, and we know that this activity has to assume certain forms, nevertheless. That does not mean—that is, someone says something a little unfittingly—that this immediately has to necessarily be some sort of action by a KGB agent. It seems to me, however, no one should have any doubts about the fact that activity is being carried out in that direction. [passage omitted]

I regret that the authors of this article are Supreme Council deputies and they are also individuals who were supported by Sajudis. It could be some of them are currently being supported. Well of course, this is precisely a search for enemies, but where are the enemies being sought? First of all, accusations are made that the legislature is searching for enemies and namely, by such methods, it wishes to do away with them. Perhaps, they will say, I am interpreting that article incorrectly. Well, the people can read it for themselves, and this is not the only article. [passage omitted]

The saddest fact rests in the fact they themselves are assaulting and themselves are crying, at the same time. [passage omitted]

It is apparent, however, that this will incite the Lithuanian people and turn them against the Supreme Council and its chairman. Thus, I would think, such matters do not enhance our society and that one needs to discuss them openly and analyze them. [passage omitted]

I, for one, would think, that such articles are not for the good of Lithuania and are not of service to it. I have a firm opinion regarding this, and I will try to explain this to people when I meet with them. [passage omitted]

Lithuania's Vausvila Meets USSR Officials

LD1005205991 Vilnius Radio Vilnius in Lithuanian 1900 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila has received USSR people's Deputies Valeriy Ochirov, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Defense and State Security, and Nikolay Strukhov, Committee member.

The visitors wished to learn about the course in Lithuania of the call-up announced by the Soviet

Union's Armed Forces' leadership, and about the position adopted by the Lithuanian Republic Government on this question.

Opinions were exchanged concerning the status of the USSR Army units stationed in the Lithuanian Republic.

Zigmas Vaisvila emphasized that these and other questions regarding the Soviet Army's activities within the Lithuanian Republic should be determined via negotiations and work groups from the interested sides' meetings, while definite agreements, obligations, and guarantees have to be established within bilateral protocols.

The USSR people's deputies expressed their approval of this proposal and promised to report the results of their meeting with the Lithuanian Deputy Prime Minister Zigmas Vaisvila, to USSR president Mikhail Gorbachev, and to Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers.

Lithuanian Paper on New Economic Blockade Threats

LD1105154491 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] A few days ago, the state daily LIETUVOS AIDAS carried information with reference to unofficial sources to the effect that chairman of the Lithuanian legislature, Vytautas Landsbergis, had received a telegram from Moscow with a warning that the Soviet Union would launch a new economic blockade of Lithuania as of 17 May. The Supreme Council Secretariat, however, has not confirmed this information to Radio Vilnius. Meanwhile, noteworthy is the government's recent decision obliging the Ministry of Power Engineering to accelerate the stocking up of state reserves of oil products and coal. Can this be interpreted as preparation for expected economic sanctions? The forecasts concerning the possible resumption of the economic blockade shared with Radio Vilnius by representatives of different Lithuanian ministries were rather contradictory. Deputy Minister of Power Engineering (Alvidas Liaukonis) gave assurances that state fuel reserves had begun to be stocked up in anticipation of the expected rise of oil and coal prices in the Soviet Union. This is quite plausible in view of the fact that Moscow presently intends to double the prices of natural gas. (Alvidas Liaukonis) also said that his constant contacts with his Soviet counterparts did not evoke apprehensions that the blockade might be resumed. Meanwhile, Deputy Minister of Material Resources (Romualdas Tarasavicius) claims that the first signs of the blockade were already conspicuous. He had information that some enterprises in Belorussia and the Ukraine had been instructed to suspend the shipment of produce to Lithuania. According to the deputy minister the supply of chemical and metallurgical industry products brought into the republic by railway has lately dropped markedly. (Romualdas Tarasavicius) pointed out that the talk about the all-around collapse of the Soviet economy was only a coverup for the economic pressure applied. As is known, the blockade of the railway traffic last year was the most painful. It is logical to expect, therefore, that if sanctions were resumed railway shipments to Lithuania would be suspended first of all.

The LIETUVOS AIDAS maintains that the threats of a new blockade in the aforementioned telegram are referring to the fact that last year Lithuania fulfilled the meat and milk purveyance agreements only by 30 percent while the Soviet Union was 100 percent true to its commitments purveying of sugar and other products to Lithuania. This argumentation is obviously faulty, even recalling last year's blockade when a major part of produce did not reach Lithuania for nearly three months. As (Petras Navickas), deputy director of the Food Products Department at the Ministry of Agriculture, told Radio Vilnius, however, the aforementioned figures reflect correctly the results of the first quarter of this year as Lithuania indeed managed to purvey only 30 percent of the expected quantity of meat and milk products since their production had plummetted. With the rise of prices on the domestic market, however, and a surplus of meat and milk products formed in the trade network, purveyance to the Soviet Union is again increased at such a tempo that our neighbors in the east find it difficult to tackle the big quantities shipped. Thus, representatives of different ministries voiced divergent assessments regarding the possibility of a new blockade of Lithuania by Moscow. No one could confirm, however, that there were documentary facts proving or denying such intentions of the Kremlin. Anything is likely.

Landsbergis Continues Visit to United States

Speaks With Former U.S. Presidents

LD1005234791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in English 2130 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] Yesterday Vytautas Landsbergis had an unexpected meeting with former President Ronald Reagan, which lasted about 20 minutes. The former American president expressed his support of Lithuanian independence, and Vytautas Landsbergis reiterated what he had said in the White House—namely that Lithuania expects more help and more active policies from the United States on the Baltic issue. Ronald Reagan showed interest in Lithuania's negotiations with the Soviet Union. Another unplanned talk took place as the Lithuanian leader was visiting Richard Nixon's museum. At that time a phone call came from Mr. Nixon's residence near New York. The former president reaffirmed his pro-Lithuanian stand, but said that did not mean he was anti-Soviet. Richard Nixon explained that the unresolved problem of the Baltic states was very harmful to the Soviet-American relations.

On the way home Vytautas Landsbergis will make a stop in Germany. On 16 May he will stay in Duesseldorf, and on the 17th in Bonn. The Lithuanian leader had planned a trip to Germany before his visit to the United States, but then put it off owing to the complicated political situation in Lithuania.

Pays Visit to Chicago

LD1105230791 Vilnius Radio Vilnius International Service in Lithuanian 2100 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] Lithuanian Supreme Council Chairman Vytautas Landsbergis continues his visit to the United States. At this hour, he should have arrived in Chicago. His arrival at Midway Airport from California is awaited by a large crowd of welcomers. Leaders of various Lithuanian-U.S. organizations have come to the welcoming ceremony. Illinois Governor James Edgar has promised to participate. Despite the fact that the somewhat indisposed leader of the Lithuanian legislature was unable to participate in the meeting with Los Angeles' mayor yesterday, the meetings in Chicago will take place as planned. He will be presented an Honorary Doctor of Laws Degree at Loyola Catholic University, and an evening reception will be held at the university. Meetings between Vytautas Landsbergis and representatives of the U.S.-Lithuanian organizations, the Chicago mayor, Richard Daley, the Chicago [word indistinct] Bernardin, businessmen, representatives of higher education institutions, and the Chicago Lithuanian community are planned during his Chicago visit. The chairman of the Lithuanian legislature arrived in Chicago, following a two-day visit to Los Angeles, where he presented a report at the World Affairs Council. In his speech, Vytautas Landsbergis urged the White House to support the Lithuanian, as well as the Latvian and Estonian, aims to participate as observers at the Helsinki process conference in June. He also emphasized that an international recognition of the republic of Lithuania is not a symbolic matter but an opportunity to protect itself from possible, new aggression.

Lithuania's Prunskiene Interviewed on Future Plans

PM1005131191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 91 Union Edition p 4

[Interview with former Prime Minister K. Prunskiene by correspondent N. Lashkevich in Vilnius; date not given: "K. Prunskiene: 'I Am Returning to Politics.' Lithuania's Former Prime Minister of the Situation in the Republic and the Country."]

[Text] Vilnius—[Lashkevich] Mrs. Prunskiene, in Lithuania today there is a situation of fragile and at the same time dangerous equilibrium in which it is unclear which way the pendulum of the "Lithuanian question" will swing. Everybody is saying: What is going to happen to Lithuania? Will a way out of the impasse of problems connected first and foremost with obtaining genuine independence be finally found?

[Prunskiene] The situation in Lithuania today is indeed very complicated and tense. Even before it was not noted for its stability; however, since 13 January it has become more prone to conflict and harder to predict. The reasons for Lithuanian society being in such a state are linked to many external and internal factors. In the first place, the uncertainty of the political situation is oppressive. So far there are no guarantees that the decisions adopted by the Supreme Soviet over the past year will be implemented. Unfortunately, even today we are only on the approaches to genuine independence—genuine, I emphasize, not merely rhetorical independence. This is linked first and foremost with the lack of positive shifts at the talks with the USSR. They are basically being dragged out on the initiative of the Soviet side, which simply cannot renounce the old thinking and adopt a more constructive attitude in relation to Lithuania. The talks held at the beginning of April and the delegations' meetings as yet do not inspire optimism.

This year, however, the republic's population has repeatedly reaffirmed its determination to live outside the Union structures. It was with this very aim that the new legislature was elected and "yes" was said to independence and democracy in the February poll-cum-referendum; awareness of the rightness and justice of their own decisions is running up against opposition from outside—and this annoys people and keeps them permanently in a tense mood. The Soviet Army's actions and the continuing occupation of seized civilian facilities are adding fuel to the flames of confrontation.

On the other hand, instability is also engendered by internal contradictions—by the polarization of political forces in the republic. There are many parties in Lithuania, but as yet they have all failed to show their worth clearly enough.

[Lashkevich] The republic's independence has not been really formalized, although in the year and a bit since 11 March much has been done to this end. Do you not consider that an incorrect course has been taken to achieve Lithuania's statehood and that insufficiently thought-out tactics of political action have been chosen?

[Prunskiene] I have no doubts about the strategic course. Lithuania should be an independent state, as historical justice demands. What tactical steps should be taken on the way to this independence is another matter. I think that we consider the problem of restoring Lithuania's independent status in too abstract a manner. True, the choice has been made and there is an understanding of historical justice, but this is not enough. Painstaking work to implement independence is necessary. It is clearly not enough merely to talk about the lawfulness of our demands and appeal to world opinion, waiting until the world deigns to respond to our calls.

[Lashkevich] How justified is the fairly tough course adopted by the Lithuanian leadership in relation to the Soviet Union? The talks have already been under way for several months now, and it is hardly fair to relieve Lithuania of all responsibility for the slow progress....

[Prunskiene] Certainly, compromises should be mutual, but what we are being offered is not a compromise, but a complete retreat. People say: Do not raise the question of recognizing independence, and then the dialogue will go swimmingly. I am sure that the Soviet leadership is making another miscalculation by ignoring the expression of the Lithuanian people's will. Remember: All our proposals about reforming the Soviet system and about practical steps within the framework of the proclaimed new thinking were continually rejected at Congresses of USSR People's Deputies. This led to a sharp confrontation in relations, and also to the conviction that the problem of the republic's political, economic, and social reorganization should be resolved autonomously. The economic sanctions, whose consequences Lithuania still feels to this day, and the armed aggression in January only confirmed us in our choice.

What prevented the USSR leadership from recognizing Lithuania's right to sovereignty, especially as this right is written into the Soviet Constitution? After all, it is only on this basis that constructive talks can be conducted. We are not so naive as not to recognize the realities of having lived together for 50 years. Both the government that I headed and, I think, the new government, understand that it is impossible to resolve many issues in a single day. For example, the presence of the Soviet Army on Lithuanian territory. Nobody is demanding an immediate troop withdrawal; that is unrealistic.

[Lashkevich] In other words, is a preliminary condition—recognizing the legality of Lithuania's declaration of independence—being set for the Union leadership?

[Prunskiene] I would not look at the question in that way. In my view, an interstate treaty in which a new status of mutual relations is enshrined should be signed. Now the dialogue between the USSR and Lithuanian Republic authorities does not match up to the situation that now exists and will develop as a result of the new national state formation in the Soviet Union. A party to the talks [subyekt peregovorov] who is as yet unknown to us is going to arise. Clearly, all federation members will be fully represented in this process. They will have their own views on sovereignty. So it is not impossible that the present talks may not be effective, as the Soviet Union is on the threshold of creating new interstate structures and, for all we know, the subjects of this association of states may even dispute the initial accords with the former central authority. The situation today is very uncertain.

[Lashkevich] I hope this does not mean that it is totally pointless to conduct a dialogue?

[Prunskiene] We could have reached agreement last year, but, alas, the Soviet side's position was inflexible and did not always take into account the situation in the country and in the world. We could have avoided many negative consequences in our mutual relations, including the 13 January tragedy. To be frank, I am worried by the shortsightedness and inability to predict the situation of those who should do this quite professionally. There is a kind of tangle of spontaneous decisions that at times defy elementary logic. For example, they seized the television center without any legal grounds for this and continue to keep it under their control, despite the complete absurdity and undemocratic nature of the situation.

[Lashkevich] Mrs. Prunskiene, despite the fact that the levers of power have been taken away from you—if I can put it like that—you are still a notable figure on the Lithuanian political scene. What practical influence could you exert today on the development of political processes in the republic? Do you have a sense of grievance?

[Prunskiene] A new stage is beginning in my political activity. Some of today's right radicals were patently in a hurry to write me off. No, I have not changed my former political views. I do not see myself as one of those "weathercocks" who are so plentiful in our political life. I will defend my position in the new role of political activist. I will work more actively in parliament and in the foreign policy arena, where I still have good contacts among European politicians. The crux of my position is concrete work to achieve independence, not mere statements, appeals, and declarations of various kinds. The world is pragmatic. Our interests must be incorporated in a wider world context, taking into account all the diversity of opinions, including the views that exist in the USSR. It is naive to suppose that our troubles and distress will make the world community rapidly and drastically change its tactics regarding Lithuania.

If my program for the gradual attainment of independence, based on a more considered and realistic approach to the restoration of the structures of the Lithuanian state, wins support, then the possibility of forming a new political organization cannot be ruled out.

[Lashkevich] Would that mean forming an opposition to the present Lithuanian leadership?

[Prunskiene] In general terms, yes. Although opposition to the present course of the legislature and government already exists. The groups that are closest to me in their political views—the Social Democratic Party, the Alliance of Liberals, the Democratic Labor Party, and a number of associations in economic spheres—stand in opposition to those political forces (in particular, the Communist Party of Lithuania) that are resisting independence and represent the USSR's incorporated interests in Lithuania, and also to today's right wing (the Independence Party, the Freedom League, and so forth). I do not share the radicalism of either group. I incline toward liberal thinking. Communist ideology can and must be opposed, but why insult individual Communists, especially former Communists? If we are opposed to the kolkhoz system, does that mean we have to immediately disband the kolkhozes and slander their leaders? There is nothing terrible about it if an individual is firmly convinced that Lithuania should be part of the USSR—that is his personal opinion, his stance. It is another matter if all these people, in the struggle for their ideas, start resorting to acts of violence. Those who planned and implemented the unconstitutional acts of 11-13 January should be brought to trial. The dangerous precedent for the armed seizure of power should be categorically condemned, so it can never be repeated.

[Lashkevich] I admit I have always been surprised by the fact that you are the most popular political leader in Lithuania, yet at the same time the most criticized. Rumor and conjecture are constantly buzzing around you, people write fairy stories about you, they gossip about you—in short, your position is not enviable. What lies behind this criticism, now that you have apparently withdrawn from the limelight?

[Prunskiene] If you are criticized and attacked from both right and left, it means there cannot be an atom of truth in it. Evidently I am a problematic and dangerous person for certain political forces, and they are simply afraid that people may follow me. It seems to me that both the Communists and the extreme right are ready to sacrifice democratic principles for the sake of their ideas. I do not understand how the Independence Party can talk about democracy when it will not admit former Communists to its ranks and when the Tautininkas party (the National party) will not admit non-Lithuanians. How can you talk about democracy if orthodox Communists are forcibly seizing and holding civilian facilities? My position on various political and economic problems is probably competitive, and that is why it is so important to them to keep attacking it.

[Lashkevich] You are under particular attack because you and your government allegedly failed to prevent the economic crisis.

[Prunskiene] It is hard to prevent something that is an objective process. The deepening of the crisis was inevitable, but we nevertheless kept the more powerful economic upheavals at bay. The former government creditably managed to escape from the economic blockade, which could have been a disaster for the republic if the policy had been less flexible. Clearly the fall of our cabinet was not caused by the price reform—extreme left-wing and extreme right-wing forces played a part. Three months later, as is known, prices were increased anyway, and, moreover, the Lithuanian economy got back to centralism: orders, targets, sanctions against leaders, and so on.

[Lashkevich] What do you intend to do in the immediate future?

[Prunskiene] At the moment I am engaged in an intensive dialogue with various political forces and discussions with industrialists and farmers. Before deciding to establish my own party or faction, there are many things I want to clear up and understand. I am not going to hurry.

[Lashkevich] How do you see the future of Lithuania?

[Prunskiene] It will take some years to get what we want—the building of an independent state. We have to create new state structures, arrange good-neighborly relations with the Soviet Union, build democratic power institutions, and recreate the free market economy. I would like to see the Soviet Union, as a new interstate entity, boldly following the path of democratic transformations. Lithuania is not going anywhere. It will always be a western neighbor state.

Landsbergis' View of Situation in Lithuania

AU1005142891 Moscow ROSSIYA in Russian No 16 20-26 April 1991 p 2

[Interview with Lithuanian Supreme Soviet Chairman Vitautas Landsbergis by ROSSIYA special correspondent Igor Mikhaylov in Villnius; date not given: "Nobody in Lithuania Feels Secure"]

[Text] [Mikhaylov] Recently, a working meeting between official delegations of the USSR and the Lithuanian Republic took place in Moscow. What are the most important positions that became apparent after the meeting?

[Landsbergis] This meeting once again demonstrated the main problem—the official powers of the Soviet delegation. As has become known to us, these powers are uncertain and vague. The Soviet delegation declared more than once that it was not authorized to discuss a number of issues that interested us.

[Mikhaylov] If the necessary official powers do not exist, is it futile to sit down at the negotiating table?

[Landsbergis] The Soviet delegation avoids referring to the meeting as negotiations. This is both surprising and suspicious; nor do many political and public figures abroad, those who showed interest in resolving the problems of the Baltic countries, understand this. All of a sudden, the Soviet side has declared that these are not negotiations. All of this is both strange and understandable. The very word "negotiations" imposes a high responsibility on the parties to the negotiations. For example, it may be more difficult to launch an armed attack while negotiations are under way....

[Mikhaylov] What basic demands and proposals were advanced by the Lithuanian side?

[Landsbergis] We have almost no new special demands beside those that are self-explanatory. This is like the biblical truths, for example, thou shalt not steal and thou shalt not kill.... If something has been stolen, it will have to be returned, regardless of whether the negotiations are official or not.

Today, we are again witnessing a situation in which Soviet troops came and seized the television tower, the television broadcasting center, and the House of the press. They had been called by criminal pretenders. The blood of Lithuanian citizens was spilled. Even though it was admitted in Moscow that these troops are present in Lithuania for reasons that violate the Constitution, they are still on our territory.

[Mikhaylov] If the Lithuanian Republic achieves independence and becomes sovereign, it will be able to develop mutually advantageous relations in the framework of the integration system involving the Soviet Union. Are you in favor of such ties?

[Landsbergis] "Ties" is a very good word; however, they must not imply subordination. Of course we are in favor of maintaining good-neighborly and useful relations with Russia.

[Mikhaylov] A number of central newspapers published information on the deterioration of the economic situation in Lithuania. Such an article was published in EKONOMIKA I ZHIZN, for example.

[Landsbergis] I do not think that the authors of these publications compared the situation in Lithuania with that in the Soviet Union. It might be useful to make such a comparison; also, it might be a good idea to recall that our republic was subjected to an economic blockade. We have suffered great losses and have not yet recovered our economic potential. Our economy is closely connected with the economic structure of the Soviet Union. If things get bad there, the situation in our republic will also deteriorate. There is nothing we can do about it and, so far, we can only mitigate the situation. Our interests are being infringed upon and this is not always done deliberately, but as a result of making mistakes.... The latest example is that, when all of us were robbed of our 50 and 100 ruble banknotes, we did our best to act in such a way that pensioners, those who had bank savings, would not suffer excessively.

[Mikhaylov] How do you see the way out of the difficult economic situation in Lithuania?

[Landsbergis] We have already started taking the necessary measures: Laws have been approved on economic reform, on privatization, and on the recognition of private property, which already exists in the republic. For example, a mechanism for returning state property to private owners will soon be discussed. If people in some places do not want to disband collective farms, they will certainly remain. We do not want to put pressure on the people.

[Mikhaylov] Three months ago, tragic events took place in Vilnius. It is known that several special groups of lawyers and experts conducted an investigation to find those to blame for the crimes that were perpetrated. What do you know about the results of their work?

[Landbergis] Several groups conducted an investigation both on behalf of the Soviet Union and Lithuania. A group of independent experts from the "Shchit" [shield] public organization participated in this work. They were the first to issue information on their conclusions. An unequivocal conclusion was reached, based on the facts collected by the experts of this group and on an analysis of these facts: The responsibility for the Army actions in Lithuania falls on the entire leadership of the Soviet Union, including its president.

Regarding our state commission, it is now finishing its work on assessing the damage caused to our republic in all spheres.

The Lithuanian Procurator's Office is investigating the incidents, which it regards as an attempt to accomplish a coup d'etat, an attempt that involved our republic's CPSU branch and various organizations created by it. Of course, specific cases of murder, robbery, and violence are also being investigated. I want to point out that the tragic events were not limited to 11-13 January. Violence is still going on. For example, it takes the form of illegal military patrols and of attacks against people. There were quite a number of attempts to provoke us, but all of them failed. Although, of course, they do contribute to maintaining tension and the state of psychological warfare. All of this cannot be accomplished unless there are instructions from Moscow.

[Mikhaylov] When I was on my way to see you, I saw barricades around the legislature building, guards inside it, and sandbags near the windows. Do you feel safe here?

[Landsbergis] I can now say with certainty: Nobody in Lithuania feels secure. As long as military units ride throughout our country in their military vehicles, without asking our permission and without notifying us, nobody will have guarantees of security. Security is only possible if independence and sovereignty are achieved.

[Mikhaylov] As is well known, a policy is pursued by the trial-and-error method, and this requires experience and knowledge. It must be very difficult for you, a nonprofessional politician, to have the leadership of the republic?

[Landsbergis] I am not experiencing great difficulties and I have people upon whom I can rely. Previous years of political activity have also created the necessary foundation and helped me to acquire important experience. Politics can be judged according to results. In my opinion, we have not made serious mistakes.

[Mikhaylov] What could you say about the situation of the Russian-speaking population in the republic? We repeatedly hear about the discrimination against the Russians in Lithuania and about the growth of nationalism in the republic. This naturally gives rise to anxiety in all of us.

[Landsbergis] The opinion that the rights of the Russians in Lithuania are being infringed upon is an opinion from faraway. We do not have an integrated Russian-speaking population in our republic. Russians, and representatives of other nationalities, live in Lithuania and represent a very heterogeneous community there. They are not scared and do not lack confidence, however, although it may seem otherwise from a distance. Of course, in a certain sense, it might be better for the Russian people to live in Russia. If a person has settled in a different country and has abandoned his motherland, he needs to know the customs and the language of that country. You cannot, for example, settle in Argentina and demand that the customs there be the same as back home. Russians live in Argentina, speak Spanish there, and respect local laws and customs.

Besides, the problems of national minorities and of the attitude to the Army are often mixed up. I would not like to offend the Russian people, but this is the reality: They are a national minority in Lithuania. When the Army is portrayed as an offended national minority, I do not understand this. By the will of its command and the political leadership in Moscow, it has been put in the position of alienation. The Army leadership declared to us that it would not obey any of our laws, the military units move anywhere they like, and their command does not inform us of its intentions. This is, in fact, the behavior of invaders. When we reach such a conclusion, the Army representatives are offended. We have long been proposing to conclude a treaty in order to avoid resentment. This treaty would have specified those conditions on the basis of which the Soviet Army is deployed in Lithuania in order to defend the Soviet Union from an American attack.... They do not want to sign a treaty. If this is the situation, why should we pay attention to the fact that our people do not show sympathy for the Soviet Army?

[Mikhaylov] Leaving political issues to one side, do you have any other hobbies, beside music, on which you are a well-known authority?

[Landsbergis] I was keen on angling and loved walking through the woods. Those were happy years when my wife and children accompanied me on kayak-paddling expeditions; however, now I must work 16-18 hours daily. There are many problems and they need to be resolved. Sometimes I manage to play a game of chess.

[Mikhaylov] How do you generally start a chess game, with what move?

[Landsbergis] As a rule, I start with king's pawn e2 to e4.

x x x

When I was leaving the capital of Lithuania, servicemen armed with submachine guns seized, on the orders of the command, the Vilnius Automobile School belonging to the All-Union Voluntary Society for Assistance to the Army, Air Force, and Navy of the USSR.

RSFSR

Yeltsin on Relations with Gorbachev, CSFR Visit

LD0905190191 Prague Domestic Service in Slovak 1630 GMT 9 May 91

[Interview with RSFSR Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin by Prague Radio correspondent Jan Smihula, in Moscow on 9 May; Yeltsin speaks in Russian fading to Slovak translation—recording]

[Excerpts] More than two weeks ago you signed the joint statement of the 10 about overcoming the crisis in Soviet society. Boris Nikolayevich, how is this document being fulfilled, how do you assess relations with Mikhail Gorbachev?

[Yeltsin] Yes, nowadays the statement is at the center of attention of our entire society and of course Russia. It provoked various reactions, though they are mostly positive. It outlines the borderline of the changes in the relations between the center and Russia. Russia used to seemingly always be represented just as a shadow of the center. It lacked its own statehood, and this shadow of 150 million people followed the center and its decisions. When we proclaimed the state sovereignty of the Russian Federation, its independence in the internal and foreign policy, at the First Congress of People's Deputies, it provoked excitement.

Mikhail Gorbachev went through very serious changes of principle and returned to the path of reforms. We support those who follow such a path, and we will take such a course together with any of the republics, including the center. Presently the Soviet president takes a rather resolute position regarding the democratization processes under way. In such a case we can do things together.

As far as personal relations with Mikhail Gorbachev are concerned, they have been various: pale, pink, grey, black, dark. What is important to take into account is the fact that personal relations are a personal thing and both of us are the leading representatives of two countries: Russia and the Soviet Union. Not to work together means the disintegration of the Union.

[Smihula] Boris Nikolayevich, in a few days, on Monday, you will leave for Czechoslovakia. This is your first official visit abroad in your capacity of chairman of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation. Why did you choose our country for such a visit, and what results do you expect?

[Yeltsin] An interesting question. Together with a group of advisors, we spent a long time discussing which country I should visit on my first official visit, whether it should be the United States, Japan, or—untraditionally—China, Europe, or countries of the former socialist camp.

We decided on Czechoslovakia because the process which is under way in your country is close to our heart. Second, we do not understand why the center delays embarking on the development of new policy on a totally different basis with all the countries. We wish to speed up this process, and we do not want to do so outside the Union, and therefore we coordinate our activities in these questions.

When I met Mikhail Gorbachev yesterday he asked me to pass his greetings to Vaclav Havel and inform him that the work on projects of agreements is under way.

This is the first and main reason for our choice. The second is a personal one. [passage omitted]

I would like to point out that our mutual relations contain both positive and negative experience. It is not possible to suddenly forget all about years of cooperation.

It is true that in 1968 we very seriously damaged Czechoslovak democracy and halted the process of democratization in your country. Not only should we admit that this was a totally anti-popular action aimed against Czechoslovakia; I should also say that we have to repent.

Interview With CSFR Journalists Cited

LD1205173191 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1110 GMT 12 May 91

[Report on an interview with Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet, with unidentified Czechoslovak correspondents, place and date not given; report by Radio Rossii commentator Boris Markovnikov—Yeltsin's remarks are recorded]

[Text] [Announcer] Yesterday evening and this morning we received telephone calls at our editorial offices at Ostankino from listeners who, for various reasons, were unable to hear the interview which Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Supreme Soviet, granted to Czechoslovak journalists. We opened our program with this yesterday. So we are repeating this piece, which was compiled by Radio Rossii commentator Boris Markovnikov.

[Markovnikov] The Czechoslovak journalists asked why Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin decided to pay his first official state visit as RSFSR Supreme Soviet chairman to Czechoslovakia.

[Yeltsin] We spent a long time considering where the first official state visit should be paid, the United States, or Japan, or maybe—to break with tradition—China, or Europe, or countries of the former socialist camp. The events, the process that is taking place in Czechoslovakia is closer to us. Second, we fail to understand the slowness of the center in starting new polices with all these countries, on a completely new basis. A year has gone by, and nothing! No new treaty has been concluded with any country. That is paradoxical. So we in Russia want to, as it were, maybe spur on this process. But we do not want to conduct this process outside the Union. We want it to be coordinated with the Union.

[Markovnikov] Other questions asked by the Czechoslovak journalists dealt with the internal situation in the Russian Federation and the Union as a whole. Particular interest was expressed in the joint statement by the president and the leaders of nine republics. In Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin's opinion, what is the importance of that document?

[Yeltsin] It, as it were, defined the boundary, changes in the relationship between the center and Russia. Russia has always been something like [word indistinct] the center. It did not have its own statehood. So it was [words indistinct], and these 150-million-strong [word indistinct] depended on the center and its decisions. When at the first Congress of People's Deputies Russia went ahead and declared its state sovereignty and independent domestic and foreign policies that, of course, did not go down very well, I would say. But that was a period of both drawing close to and drawing away from the center. It seems to me that [word indistinct] statement at that time, that the president had veered to the right, and I was obliged to warn him about his right up to [word indistinct]. Of course he underwent some very serious internal (?changes), such fundamental changes and eventually returned to the path of reforms. For the fact is that (?we are all) on the path of reforms. We will pursue that path with any republic, and that includes the center, too.

Presently, Gorbachev is demonstrating a pretty determined position regarding continuing democratic reforms. In that case we can act together. This statement that all the nine top leaders of sovereign states and the country's president have worked out together very fundamentally important, and the first to move away from that document perishes. We have differing personal relationships where Gorbachev is concerned. What has to be borne in mind here is that personal matters are one thing, but we are two leaders of two states—the Russian state and the Union—and not to work together would mean the Union heading for disintegration. So we have to work together. I believe that the compromise achieved with the joint statement provides the opportunity for us to work together.

Yes, many people have been saying and continue to say that I personally have lost something politically. But that is only a first impression. Moreover it is said by those who are not familiar with the other side of that meeting, namely those accords which are not contained in the statement. These are particularly important things. For instance, the insistence on getting down immediately to implementing a mechanism for division of functions between the center and the republics, including Russia. [passage indistinct] Second, to hand over to the republics the right to general licensing [passage indistinct]. This is a very serious concession on his part, and I consider that it was we who won that right in signing the statement. Third, there was an important accord concerning foreign currency, and fourth, one concerning gold.

So, you see, there were a whole series of such points which we agreed upon with the president in addition to the statement. On the basis of those accords [words indistinct] it seems to me that we won some victories here.

Of course, society took, as it were, a rather measured attitude. There was the war of laws and so forth stirred up by the press, and now that we have (?to some extent) started moving in the same direction but (?adhering to) our positions of principle we will not retreat from them under any circumstances. If I supported the workers' strike movement then today I still support it. Incidentally, the miners have announced today that they are all going back to work, following my trip to the Kuzbass. For us that is extremely important, because the miners will be followed back to work by the steelworkers, everyone who was affected by the blast-furnaces being at a standstill, and many other enterprises, too. This is a step toward the stabilization of the economy. All in all, the statement was undoubtedly [word indistinct]. Yes, of course, it was [words indistinct] was achieved.

[Markovnikov] Were there any other documents signed at this meeting, for instance, a secret memorandum about which there is a lot of talk at the moment? The president has said that nothing was signed apart from the official statement.

[Yeltsin] No. He's right there. No secret documents were signed. But there is one thing. When we met the president, the first time for five hours, the second time for five hours, the third time for three hours, we agreed—and these agreements are not being fulfilled. But it is difficult even to talk publicly about this, because the conversation was private, literally. We didn't even have a translator there. But we're talking about a meeting of 10 people, including the nine supreme leaders of sovereign states. This is a completely different thing. Subsequently, yesterday in fact, I said to him: Under our agreement you are taking only the first step, or something to that effect. So, there was no officially recorded document on other questions which we agreed on. But we did agree. We agreed, the 10 people sitting there. You can't hush this up, you have to own up. Although we did not record what was said, the agreement on general licensing, for instance, will be forwarded to all sovereign republics and states. That's the direction things took. The Cabinet of Ministers knows this. The other republics know it. There were things like this.

[Markovnikov] The Russian Federation is entering the republican presidential election campaign. Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin has been nominated as a presidential candidate. How does he see his chances?

[Yeltsin] Well, for a start, (?everyone, believer or nonbeliever) probably has a certain inner sense of (?superstition). I hope and am certain in advance that [words indistinct]. There are seven candidates today. Among them, Ryzhkov has declared himself. Bakatin has not declared firmly, but he hasn't said he won't run. I think there is an inner struggle going on there. He has a strong sense of moral propriety, and he by no means wants to stand against Yeltsin. At the same time, certain forces are pushing him into it. This applies to Ryzhkov and Bakatin. [passage indistinct] One should not forget that the RCP, the Russian Communist Party, will of course be campaigning against, and that applies to the CPSU as a whole, although inside the CPSU itself a very interesting movement has now emerged, the Communists for Democracy. I believe that this will split the party in general. If 4 million leave the RCP with its 8 million plus members, or (?join) the Communists for Democracy platform, this will of course change the whole climate and alter the whole correlation of forces in society, including Russia.

Take a look at the official opinion polls. (?We discussed this with) our main institutes, and we discussed this with the professors at the supreme coordination-consultative committee. There is such a think-tank center under the chairman of the Supreme Soviet. Never before has such a thing existed anywhere: not in the Union, nor in Russia. The Politburo and the Presidential Council had the practice of selecting people on the grounds of arch-personal loyalty.

Whereas, this is a think-tank. The people that are gathered together here, from a writer to an academician, are independent. They are not paid for this. But when we get together.... [Yeltsin changes thought] Take yesterday: there was only one issue on the agenda, steps the Supreme Soviet chairman should undertake up to 12 June. In addition to the stenographic account I personally wrote down clever thoughts (?that were expressed). I listed 110 of them. But the thing is that they concern not only a period of little more than a month. They relate to what should be done further on in the future.

Well, suppose (?I am) elected, what steps should then—there are a lot of questions that need an answer here—what first steps should be undertaken?

They must not just try to impress, in my opinion. We must not seek that these 100 days, or the first steps, will be noticed only from the viewpoint of an impression. The line must be continued toward what has to be done in order for the people to support you, (?as they do now). This line must be continued, taking into consideration the rights the president is acquiring.

There are plans on what has to be done immediately. This is why, maybe, among the first decrees to be signed will be to reduce the party's influence in state institutions and organizations. The draft is ready. If you are involved in political and party work, you must do it outside these organizations, and your own free time. Because under the conditions of a pluralist system, to have 12-15 party committees at an enterprise is just nonsense, while the CPSU is still thinking that it will still exist on its own. No.

Now the process of, so to speak, splitting the CPSU is going to start. First many have already left; millions, I suppose. While if now the Rutskoy effect, as they call it after a people's deputy of Russia, is going to develop.... [Yeltsin changes thought] He took the floor at the congress and set up a deputies' group, Communists for Democracy, in our legislature. This process has already started. In 75 regions of the Russian Federation such groups have been already set up. I think it is extremely interesting. The plenum is going to take place on the 13th, I think. Rutskoy wanted to be a member of our delegation [words indistinct]. But he is not a member of the RCP Central Committee. So, they decided, so to speak, to put him against the wall. But he is a fighter, you know, a Hero of the Soviet Union. He is certainly a unique person. So he said: I am going to fight them there. The Central Committee members decided to (?expell) him, Well, it is interesting what they are (?going to decide).

[Markovnikov] There was also a question on the new Union treaty. Who is going to sign it? Is it only the Union republics that were members of the federation, or other republics as well?

[Yelstin] That's very complicated. It was precisely this issue that we were discussing yesterday, the issue of participation in the signing of the Union treaty of the republics of Russia, the 16 republics of Russia, those that have declared their sovereignty, equally Union and autonomous. It's the most complex question. Those eight Union republics that (?signed) the treaty, well, plus Russia, they say no, we won't sign the Union treaty if the treaty is signed by the republics in Russia, because then it turns out there are 16 of you, or 17. If we consider that every republic as a unit has a quota in legislature, then with any issue, you come to an arrangement in Russia, and you can either throw out or push through any issue. When I met here in the evening of the day before yesterday with all the heads of our (?nine) republics I talked about this to them. (?I don't consider) that we have become the initiators of the collapse of the Union. That is so, isn't it? So, yesterday, discussing in such a in quotation marks, narrow circle, this very problem, we all the same came to describing it like this: nine in alphabetical order, but where further than "r" for the RSFSR, the delegations also go further below in alphabetical order. Thus, it is a kind of compromise variation. Indeed, they are participants in the establishment of a new federation, but simultaneously they are in Russia. Moreover, it is only a question of the quota in the legislature

Yeltsin Stresses Need To 'Work Together'

LD1105171991 Moscow World Service in English 1600 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] The head of the Russian parliament, Boris Yeltsin, has declared that in order to continue democratic reforms he is ready to go ahead with any republic and the central government. He told journalists that President Gorbachev now demonstrates resolution in continuing such reforms. If we do not work together, he said, the Soviet Union will simply disintegrate. He described as erroneous the opinion that he suffered a political defeat by signing the nine-plus-one declaration. Yeltsin said that, among other things, the leaders of the nine republics and the president agreed to immediately start applying the mechanism of separating the functions of the center and the republics and transferring general export licensing to the republics. Understandings on gold and currency were also reached. Yeltsin said that no secret memorandum was signed at the conference in Novo-Ogarevo.

Ryzhkov Interviewed as Yeltsin Challenger

PM1005220191 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 11 May 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with N.I. Ryzhkov by Lieutenant Colonel S. Pashayev under the "Presidential Contenders" rubric, place and date not given: "N.I. Ryzhkov: It Was a Difficult Decision for Me"]

[Text] As has been reported in our paper, N.I. Ryzhkov, who headed the country's government until recently, has agreed in principle to run for the post of Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] president. Our correspondent met with Nikolay Ivanovich.

[Pashayev] Nikolay Ivanovich, it is no secret that society today is not only extremely politicized and agitated, but also weary and disenchanted with the long years of political battles, wars of words, and promises. In this connection it is not surprising that the appearance of your name on the list of candidates for the post of president of Russia arouses conflicting feelings in voters. Who do you intend to look to during the election marathon, who are your potential supporters?

[Ryzhkov] You are right, the situation is an unfortunate one at the moment. During the last few years we have been, as everyone has felt for himself, in a state of constant social-political tension. Politicization has reached its utmost limit. It has been election campaign after election campaign, congress after congress, session after session, and party forum after party forum. This has naturally had an effect on millions of people.

It cannot go on forever and it is an abnormal, morbid state for society to be in, one that is fraught with disastrous consequences—social and economic included. We have all this already. We must break out of this vicious circle. There must be a period of stabilization, an atmosphere in which people can start to work quietly and avoid excessive emotions

This is a long way off yet. Meanwhile dissension holds sway, engendering and feeding everyone's disenchantment. In particular with perestroyka, let's face it. Indeed, the hopes that the cure was about to be found, that things would change for the better are beginning to evaporate. That is extremely worrisome. Stabilization is vital for us at the moment. You see, we have been going downhill since 1989 and the results of the first quarter of this year are all the more alarming. People are tired of all this.

In a sense it was this that prompted me to seriously consider the many suggestions that I should participate in the election campaign and agree to run. It was a tough decision, because in recent years, as you know, I have been at the epicenter of events. And perhaps more than anyone else I felt the tension of this crucial and very difficult stage in our country's life. I am convinced that it is Russia that should be the center, the initiator of consolidation. One cannot stand on the sidelines, observing events from afar in this situation, particularly knowing in detail the situation the RSFSR is in.

On the other hand, I am profoundly convinced that given that it possesses such resources, such productive forces, and such an enviable history, our republic-state can and must have a better life. I am most resolute in my intention to uphold Russians' interests. The task is to resurrect Russia, to consolidate compatriots, and create conditions for peaceful, tranquil accords and for consideration of all positions, without destroying the Union—unlike some, I believe that the Union must not be destroyed.

Unfortunately, recent events confirm my worse fears: Despite the high-sounding statements by current republic leaders, changes for the better are not taking place. There is always confrontation and people are constantly looking for reasons to exacerbate and divide. There is also, of course, inertia, but above all there is the leadership's impotence, which is masked by political hustle and bustle.

I am not overestimating myself, I am aware of the mistakes that were made, but they, on the other hand, make for more sober judgment and greater experience. I have a growing belief today that there is a way out. I am working hard on my election program at the moment. It will be finalized very soon, published, and I believe, will meet the interests of the majority of my compatriots, not of the 5-10 percent of Russians certain people are counting on at the moment. Above all it will meet the interests of the working class, the peasantry, the intelligentsia, and the least protected strata of the population. These people will, I believe, be among my supporters.

I intend to propose a moderately radical path, which will not face people with insuperable hardship. Certainly it will not be easy. Certainly, changes are necessary, we have to have them. But the price one pays for this can vary. One cannot shift the burden onto the shoulders of those for whom life is unbearable as it is. In this sense the price rises and the public reaction to this step are a more than serious lesson. It is appropriate recalling here that similar measures which I once promulgated on behalf of the government were far gentler and far better balanced.

[Pashayev] Your chief rival at the election will, in all probability, be B.N. Yeltsin, the head of the Russian legislature, whom you know from Sverdlovsk. Many think that the views, programs, and aspirations of Ryzhkov and Yeltsin are diametrically opposite and incompatible. Is that so? What brings you together and what divides you as politicians and statesmen?

[Ryzhkov] I would like to think there will be many worthy rivals. As for Boris Nikolayevich, I have indeed known him a long time, since Sverdlovsk. He worked at the party oblast committee and I worked at a plant. I can say that I do not agree with many of Yeltsin's ideas and plans. And I will fight, I will demonstrate categorically that the path he proposes is the the wrong one. I would like the rivalry to be properly conducted, of course. I say this remembering a speech by Comrade Yeltsin last summer, when we presented on behalf of the government our program for the transition to the market. Instead of using arguments, showing its weak points, and demonstrating the obvious pluses, so it was said, of the Shatalin-Yavlinskliy program, he and his supporters chose a different path. They started using blatant pressure and a campaign began beneath the slogan "Down with the government!;" it was rabble-rousing.... Is that the right way to conduct the struggle? I believe it should be a battle of ideas and arguments, not excited masses of people holding rallies.

Of course, Boris Nikolayevich is rooting for Russia and its interests in his own way. Obviously that unites us, two Russians, who are not indifferent to the trouble we are experiencing today and from which we are seeking a way out. But, in my view, the era of blind, fanatical faith in fancy words, and flashy slogans is over and people are learning to make their own considered choice—assessing, comparing ideas and proposals with their own criteria, with their own social and political ideals.

One could say a great deal about what divides us. But I will touch on only one point in our conversation. Everyone recalls the fiery battles at the Russian congress over private ownership of land, which eventually resulted in a compromise. The line of Yeltsin and his supporters was basically that land has to be sold. I believe, though, and I do not know whether the voters will support me or not, that private ownership of land cannot be introduced in our conditions. It is a decision with far-reaching consequences. Yes, it seems simple today—sell a patch of land and that is that; but what will happen then, years later?

Certainly, a person—peasant, commodity producer—has to have a firm hold of the land, has to have guarantees. Well, let us allot him and his family land for 50 years, for 100. Let us say that in law the peasant family has the right to bequeath it and enjoy it for all time. But this option does not suit those who see land—which is a gift given by nature, a God-given gift—simply as a commodity, who intend to make it an object of commerce. This is precisely what I am opposed to. Not only I, incidentally, but many country people as well.

I would add to that the fact that we are all romantics to some extent. It is clear to any unprejudiced person that kolkhozes [collective farms] and sovkhozes [state farms] are the foundation of commodity production in the countryside today. You cannot get away from that. When we say that in a year there will be a system of individual private farmers, which will feed everyone, it is an illusion. I favor a mixed agriculture. I say this not to be fashionable. When I was one of the country's leaders and a member of its political leadership, I advocated this very approach and, incidentally, advocated that both the word and the concept of individual farming should be legalized and became part of daily life.

[Pashayev] The burden that the future RSFSR president would place upon himself is an unenviable one. What can, what must be done today and tomorrow to halt the destructive processes? What is your view, in this connection, of plans of an emergency nature?

[Ryzhkov] I have already mentioned the chief condition—renunciation of confrontation. Russians are on the brink of the abyss, we are right on the edge, and we must recognize this and draw conclusions. People's futures, the future of Russia and the Union are in peril. The fatherland's very history, the memory of our ancestors now call for reason, for an abandonment of the present-day internecine strife.

Second—it is necessary to avert the final collapse of the economy. This we must all understand together. There are several ways out of the crisis. I can tell you that life itself demanded that we make the transition to market relations. The rigid command-and-administer system has run its course. But transition is movement, not destruction. Here again we must stop politics from pressuring the economy. Life has already punished us for that and it is time learn not to try to make economic processes fit political slogans. Is not the current chaos proof that we rushed into the market without oars and a compass, so to speak, by failing to do all the calculations and formulate the "rules of the game?"

In my view, we must now seek compromise solutions. First, under no circumstances must we diverge from the path to the market. Second, given that some economic processes are now out of control, tough state regulation must be exercised at some points. Of course, we are not talking about any "emergency" measures, which are closely associated in the public mind with martial law. Such suggestions are absurd. We are talking about a special regime governing the functioning of certain sectors of the national economy. There is the market, there is the economic space; market relations are developing, but weak spots have appeared, where the market is not providing opportunities for normal operations. Take agriculture. Why not say: Comrades, you are operating in market conditions, but the state will not leave you in the lurch; it will provide fertilizers, equipment, and other resources.

So we are talking about a limited special regime in some sectors of the national economy, which cannot function at the moment without state help. They include, aside from agriculture, light industry, and basic sectors. See what is happening with the coal miners. And what a chain of failures their problems lead to: coal—rolled metal—machine building.... A chain reaction.

Problems of law and order must be tackled immediately and the mounting mayhem in our streets must be stopped....

[Pashayev] Among the readers of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA there are many servicemen who are keen to know your stance on army problems. What is your view of the hail of criticism directed at the armed forces, of the idea of creating a Russian Army, of the social problems of those who have linked their lives with the cause of defending the fatherland?

[Ryzhkov] As far as the army is concerned, I have a firm belief which I have never changed. I believe that our historical roots, above all those of Russia as the founder of our state, are literally steeped in respect for our army. Happen what may in our land, when things are at their worst, in the most critical place, the man in the gray coat always turns up. War, earthquake, strife between two peoples—he is a live barrier in the way of bloodshed and animosity.... How much has been built by soldiers' hands, how much has been preserved and saved—of the grain and last year's potatoes, sacrificed in favor of rallies and marches. How can one not respect it, the army—men and officers?

This does not mean, of course, that there are no shortcomings, problems, incidents, crimes in the army. There are, as there are anywhere else. But the maladies must be treated, dealt with seriously. And wholesale vilification is quite out of place here, perfectly intolerable.

As for the problems, the country and the republic-states, including Russia, should play a larger part in the sphere of concern for the army. Particulary in conditions of the transition to the market. We have badly neglected the social sphere and as a result officers and their families are actually living in poverty. It is tough being a soldier. Things are changing here already, there are plans; some questions demand study and swift solutions.

I do not think I am mistaken when I say that the consequences of the anti-army campaign, which certainly have a political tinge, are already beginning to tell. Look at the deserters, the draft dodgers—these are things that were unheard-of for the Soviet Army, the Army of Russia. They are worring signs and my stance is a very firm one—this cannot be tolerated.

As for the plans to create "Russia's own Army"—I believe this is just frivolous. It is no accident, I believe, that Yeltsin's statement on this prompted a mighty wave of criticism. Who would this army oppose, who would it attack? Some other republic or the center? There is something else that is incomprehensible: How, given the modern equipment and the present level of army control—control of all its facilities and forces—can one seriously intend to divide the army up, fragment defence. That is committing suicide in public, believe me. No wonder this idea caused alarm abroad. Defense, the army—this is a very serious business, and the two must be one.

[Pashayev] You will be meeting with voters and touring the Russian Federation. Where do you propose to go?

[Ryzhkov] We are working on the itinerary right now. But, whatever it is, I will certainly be visiting the military. That I promise.

Soyuz Group Supports Ryzhkov Candidacy

LD1205190191 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1830 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Moscow, 12 May (TASS)—A meeting of the Soyuz group of deputies took place here today to propose and support a candidate for the post of president of the Russian Federation. Nikolay Ryzhkov, a candidate for this post, spoke at the meeting.

As a result of the discussion, it was decided to support the labor collectives that submitted the candidacy of Nikolay Ryzhkov for the post of president. Deputies also called on the participants of the Soyuz all-Union people's movement to support this candidacy.

Lipetsk Workers Criticize Ryzhkov's 'Tractability'

PM0905100991 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 9 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[Correspondent V. Stepnov article: "Who Is Tc Lead Russia; Candidates Nominated"]

[Excerpts] The "single-candidate" elections that prevailed for so many years in our society and seemed normal are becoming a thing of the past. In a civilized country a person should have the right to choose the candidate who most impresses him in terms of political convictions and professional and moral qualities. That is what the campaign to elect the president of the Russian Federation is like, particularly in Lipetsk Oblast.

The nomination of presidential candidates is a stormy, equivocal process here. Thus, teachers thought it necessary to nominate B. Gromov, USSR deputy minister of internal affairs. Novolipetsk metallurgical combine personnel nominated B. Yeltsin, chairman of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Supreme Soviet. The possibility that other names will also be put forward is not ruled out. But now it is already quite obvious that N. Ryzhkov enjoys the greatest sympathies among the people of Lipetsk. He has been nominated at the oblast's sovkhozes [state farms] and kolkhozes [collective farms] and the city's organizations and enterprises. [passage omitted]

Tractor builders said many warm words about N. Ryzhkov but they did not stint on the criticism either. They pointed out his excessive tractability and mildness. They are, after all, right on that score. Everyone now realizes that a political leader needs firmness in addition to all the best qualities in order to extricate the country from the crisis.

Lipetsk tractor builders have behaved with restraint and dignity amid the present upsurge of political passions where some politicians are not ashamed to do their utmost to abuse and even sling mud at their dissenting opponents, going beyond what is permitted, in order to achieve their ends. There were no impolite attacks on anyone during the election meeting. One person alone—Nikolay Ivanovich Ryzhkov—was nominated as candidate RSFSR president.

Commission Chief Opposes Postponing Election

LD1205144691 Moscow TASS in English 1408 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 12 TASS—Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission of Russia Vasiliy Kazakov, engaged in preparations for the election of Russian president, refused to name candidates for the post.

In an interview with the TRUD newspaper published today, he said that not a single aspirant filed an application for registration, which is to end on May 21.

However, chairman of the Russian parliament Boris Yeltsin and former Soviet Prime Minister Nikolay Ryzhkov are known to aspire for the presidency.

There are rumours that former Interior Minister Vadim Bakatin, leader of the centrist bloc V. Voronin and economist Aleksey Sergeyev from the United Front of Working People also intend to run for the presidency.

The elections of Russian president are set for June 12, 1991. According to the election law, any citizen of the Russian Federation at the age of 35-65, who will collect over 50 per cent of votes, may be elected president.

Candidates may be nominated by republican political parties, political movements, trade unions, mass political movements registered in legally established order and factory workers, if the candidates are supported by at least 100,000 Russian voters.

In Kazakov's opinion, the peculiar feature of the present electoral campaign is its short period. Candidates are to be nominated no later than 25 days before election day.

Therefore, some organisations, including the Coordination Council of Russian Patriotic Forces insist on postponing the elections, saying that such a short period of time "turns into a fiction" the right to nominate candidates.

However, the Electoral Commission chairman opposes the postponement. "The postponement of the elections, say to this autumn, will improve the machinery of their holding," he said.

"But Russia will be in a state of turmoil for more than three months. Let us elect the president on June 12 and begin, at long last, to settle urgent economic and other problems," he noted.

Russian Party Leaders on Presidential Election

LD1005155591 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1445 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Igor Agabekov]

[Text] Moscow, 10 May—A meeting here today between leaders of the Russian National Party, the Conservative Party, and a number of public movements was devoted to discussing the question of the forthcoming election of a president of Russia.

At a press conference after the meeting Aleksey Brumel, leader of the recently created Russian National Party which, in his words, numbers some 600 people, reported that he does not yet intend to put himself forward as a candidate for the post of president of Russia, but if his party gets into power it will invite Great Prince Vladimir Romanov, who now lives in Paris, to the Russian throne. Asked whether the Russian National Party has gained the consent of the great Prince to the Russian reign, Aleksey Brumel answered in the affirmative.

Lev Ubozhko, leader of the Conservative Party, well known for his extremely radical views, believes that the forthcoming elections for a president of Russia are "nothing other than a farce." "Everything," he asserted, "has been done in such a way that there are no alternative candidates to Russian Supreme Soviet Chairman Boris Yeltsin." Lev Ubozhko himself recently put forward his own candidacy for the post of president of Russia.

Arkadiy Bugayev, president of the International Academy of Concord, who is also intending to run in the elections for a president of Russia, reported on the founding of a "Russian department of a world party of common sense." The aim of the new party, he said, is "the creation of a world without borders, armies, and weapons," the "rebirth of the bases of a state-religious family, and the creation of a world government on the basis of the United Nations."

Official Views RSFSR Presidential Election

91UN1458A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 May 91 First Edition p 3

[Interview with V.I. Kazakov, chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, by SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA correspondent N. Garifullina under the rubric "On the Presidential Elections in Russia;" place and date not given: "Needed... A Hundred Thousand"]

[Text] *The elections of the first president in history of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] is set for 12 June of this year. SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA is taking part in this important political campaign by opening a permanent rubric: "On the Presidential Elections in Russia."*

The Campaign Calendar

10 May—organizational work of setting up electoral precincts and precinct electoral commissions ends

Second decade of May—registration of candidates for RSFSR president and their authorized representatives starts

18 May—last day for nominating candidates for president and for collection of signatures in support of candidates

18 May—last day for presenting signature lists to the Central Electoral Commission

21 May—Fourth Congress of RSFSR People's Deputies opens; registration of candidates for president and their authorized representatives begin.

26 May—publication of information on candidates registration ends

11 June—last day for campaigning for or against candidates for RSFSR president and for their meetings with voters

12 June—election day of the first president in history of the Russia

22 June—final results of the elections

V.I. Kazakov, Chairman of the Central Electoral Commission, Answers Questions

[Garifullina] Vasiliy Ivanovich, which stage of the election campaign do you see as most significant and complicated?

[Kazakov] I think it is the collection of signatures in support of a candidate. By law, our candidates for president are nominated through two channels. One is through public organizations, parties, professional unions, and sociopolitical movements. In this case, in addition to nominating a contender in accordance with established procedures, he also must get 20 percent of the votes of the total number of deputies at the Congress of People's Deputies. The second channel is through workers collectives of enterprises, organizations, educational institutions, or assembly of voters by place of residence. In this case a candidate may be registered if he is supported by 100,000 voters. This is the most topical issue right now, since the collection of signatures started.

[Garifullina] The law stipulates that the collection of signatures is conducted by the initiating group. How is it formed?

[Kazakov] A workers collective that nominates a candidate simultaneously creates—on the basis of the Law on the Referendum that contains an appropriate clause—an initiating group. It must be registered with the soviet executive committee. Following the forms, also stipulated by the law on referendums, the initiating group offers the voters special lists where a citizen, who wishes to express his support for a candidate, must write in his full name, birth date, residential address, and the number and series of his passport or other equivalent document. Then these lists are certified by the chairman of the initiating group or by one of its members. The executive committee may decide to randomly check the validity of signatures. There are no plans for mass verification.

The final protocol, certified by the soviet executive committee's seal, is presented to the Central Electoral Commission either by the initiating group or by the coordinating council of such groups.

[Garifullina] I would like to clarify a point: Are the signatures collected in places where the candidate is nominated, or across Russia?

[Kazakov] Everywhere, throughout the entire RSFSR. Signatures may be collected by the group of the collective that nominated the candidate, and similar groups in support of this candidate may be formed in any region of the republic. Let us say, Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov is nominated by one workers collective. In another oblast, kray, or autonomous republic he is not nominated again; a meeting, in which no less than 300 voters participate, forms an initiating group to collect signatures in support of the same Ivan Ivanovich Ivanov. There may be several such groups, and their title sheet should include the data on this particular candidate.

[Garifullina] What is the time frame for collecting signatures?

[Kazakov] Signature lists must be presented to the Central Electoral Commission no later than 18 May. By the way, 18 May is also the last day for a candidates' nomination. Their registration will start in the second decade of May and will end on 21 May. Information on registrations will be published in the press as this action takes place; the last day for publishing information is 26 May.

[Garifullina] What is the procedure for including candidates on the ballot?

[Kazakov] Article 7 of the Law on Presidential Elections stipulates that the secret ballot for electing the RSFSR president shall include candidates supported by 100,000 citizens, and candidates supported by no less than one-fifth of the total number of deputies. Candidates who collected 100,000 signatures do not have to be confirmed by the congress; however, those who were only nominated by a public organization must win over 20 percent of supporters at the congress. If a candidate is both nominated by a public organization and by a workers collective, and the initiating group has collected 100,000 signatures, such candidate is placed on the ballot automatically.

[Garifullina] Judging by the number of candidates already nominated, we can expect a heated race for the post of president. The quality of this campaign will depend to a large degree on the composition of electoral commissions.... What is the principle by which these commissions are formed?

[Kazakov] Precinct electoral commissions are formed in accordance with the Law on Elections of People's Deputies; as is known, this law does not mention the representation of parties and sociopolitical movements. Candidates to these commissions are nominated by workers collectives; then they are formed by soviets or their presidiums. Last year, in some places it was even done on a competitive basis.

Our central commission was formed rather on territorial, or even national, basis. We have, for instance, an Altayan, a Lak, a Chuvash, a Tatar, a Bashkir, an Udmurt, etc.

Representatives of various political parties and movements may participate in the commissions' work as observers. By the way, this is also recommended by the resolutions of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, which charges the Central Electoral Commission with the responsibility for conducting this campaign.

[Garifullina] What is special about this campaign—other than the fact, of course, that this is the first presidential election?

[Kazakov] The first special feature—and that is also the difficulty—is the short time span of the campaign. The election campaign actually starts from the moment of a candidates' registration, which, as you know, will be conducted between 12 May and 21 May, and the election itself is on 12 June.

[Garifullina] Do you already have applications for candidate registration?

[Kazakov] So far, we do not have any, and this is understandable: A candidate must supply an extensive list of documents—a protocol of nomination, a candidate's consent, and biographical data signed personally by the candidate; then he must name the candidate for vice president, and provide a list of authorized representatives.... I think the second week of May will be the peak of registration activity. Then, after the Congress of People's Deputies, the main difficulty will be the preparation of the ballots. There is not much time; therefore, we will not be able to accomplish it in a centralized manner. Ballots will have to be printed from the sample we will publish in the central newspapers.

[Garifullina] Vasiliy Ivanovich, the last question, which concerns many voters. How can fraud and falsification in voting be avoided? Even one extra vote may be of crucial importance.

[Kazakov] The simplest way is the one we used during the referendum. Electoral commissions were "marking" ballots by a special mark—a seal, a stamp, or a signature of one of the commission's members. There was a case—I do not remember where exactly—when about 20 unmarked ballots were found. They were, of course, removed during the counting. At one of the electoral precincts in Moscow's Sevastopolskiy Rayon, 384 extra ballots were discovered! Unfortunately, the precinct commission ignored our recommendation.

The election of RSFSR president is truly a destiny-setting event. It is important to elect a person we can entrust, without fear and concern, with the destiny of the people and of Russia. Therefore, there are no unimportant details in this campaign, since each of them may be fatal. Let us hope that we will not make a wrong choice!

Krasnodar Declares State of Emergency in Kuban

LD1005134891 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1033 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Viktor Zhilyakov]

[Text] Krasnodar, 10 May (TASS)—The authorities in Russia's main granary, the Kuban, have introduced emergency measures in the agrarian sector to save the upcoming harvest.

A decision adopted today by the Presidium and Executive Committee of Kranodar Kray Soviet of People's Deputies notes that the prolonged rainy spring has disrupted the optimal times for sowing agricultural crops. A particularly critical situation has arisen in the rice fields, where sowing has virtually only just begun.

The authorities' measures envisage sending additional vehicles, tractors and, if necessary, workers from other enterprises to help the farms. During the period when the emergency measures will be in operation (until mid-June), local bodies are given the right to dismiss agrarian sector staff members who do not carry out their instructions.

A state of emergency was declared in the Kuban last year also, but that was during the harvest season. At that time the measures helped preserve the harvest that was lost to a considerable extent in other regions through inefficiency.

Democratic Russia Plenum Postponed

LD1005180391 Moscow Radio Rossii Network in Russian 1330 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] At an unscheduled session of the Democratic Russia Movement Coordination Council, it was decided to postpone the plenum of the council of the movement's representatives until 1 June. This decision is connected with a change in the schedule for the election campaign of Boris Yeltsin. It is planned that the chairman of the Russian Federation Supreme Soviet should make a lengthy keynote speech at the Democratic Russia plenum.

Taking part in the work of the program will be Gavriil Popov, mayor of Moscow, the Democratic Russia candidate, and Yuriy Afanasyev, candidate for Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy for the Pervomayskiy constituency of Moscow, who is also being nominated by Democratic Russia.

Russian KGB Reorganization Reviewed

LD1205031191 Moscow Central Television Second Program Network in Russian 1645 GMT 11 May 91

[Interview with Sergey Vadimovich Stepashin, chairman of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic, RSFSR, Supreme Soviet Committee on Security, by RSFSR People's Deputy S.A. Nosovets in Moscow, date not given; from the "Russian Legislative Herald" program—live or recorded]

[Text] [Nosovets] As you have probably already realized, here at the Russian Supreme Soviet they do not like loud words and pompous expressions. Yet, I want to call the document that I'm holding in my hands historic. This is the protocol on the accord concerning the formation of a Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] Committee for State Security. It was signed by Chairman of the Russian Supreme Soviet Yeltsin and chairman of the USSR KGB Kryuchkov. Just one paragraph, the first paragraph in this protocol: to form the RSFSR Committee for State Security—RSFSR KGB—with the status of a Union-republican state committee, and to subordinate to it the territorial organs of the USSR KGB located in the RSFSR. I am talking to the chairman of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet Committee on Security, Sergey Vadimovich Stepashin. He took part in the signing of this document, and I think that he will be able to give us further details.

[Stepashin] Well, first, regarding whether this is a historic document or not—and by the way, these are actually the words of Chairman of the USSR KGB Vladimir Aleksandrovich Kryuchkov, when we were signing the protocol yesterday, Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin and Kryuchkov, after it was completed and after the handshakes—Kryuchkov said something along these lines: that this is the first time in the history of the existence of the organs of the VchK, OGPU, NKVD, and KGB [former names of the Soviet security service] that such a document has existed, for there have indeed not been any documents of this type before, and that from this day a new life is beginning for the organs of the Committee for State Security of the Russian Federation.

[Nosovets] What are the main provisions of this protocol?

[Stepashin] Well, in the first place, I want to make the proviso straight away that this is a protocol on an accord for the creation of a Committee for State Security—that is, it is the beginning of the long, serious, and I think, very difficult road of forming truly Russian organs for the protection of human rights, as we define them for ourselves: a Committee for State Security. Preparations for this protocol lasted two or three months; meetings were held on several occasions with the leadership of the KGB; we held quite serious consultations with the leadership of the Supreme Soviet; and I want to note straight away that both the talks and the actual fact of the signing of the protocol went off very constructively. To be honest, there were certain apprehensions, and many RSFSR people's deputies still harbor them, including this: will the USSR KGB really hand over very serious territorial subdivisions so easily, hand over the backbone of the Union KGB to a Russian committee? But as you can see, the protocol in question has come about. Apart from the position connected with the fact that as of today, as I have already said, territorial subdivisions are passing to the jurisdiction of the Russian committee, the protocol also defines the following positions. First, we agreed that at the present stage our Russian committee will be of Union-republican subordination. The point of this lies in the fact that a number of functions—say, intelligence and counter-intelligence—will be under the joint jurisdiction of the KGB of the Union and the KGB of the Russian Federation.

[Nosovets] Which accords with the declaration of sovereignty.

[Stepashin] Which accords with the declaration of sovereignty, with the work practice of such organs in other countries, and in general with the spirit of the statement by the nine, which was also signed by Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin. And so there are no differences of interpretation here. The second factor—also a very important and fundamental one: In this protocol we have made provision for the composition of two commissions, a commission from the Russian Federation and a commission from the KGB, which within perhaps six to eight weeks, before the signing of the Union treaty, should determine and prepare a draft agreement on the demarcation of functions between the RSFSR KGB and the USSR KGB. I will say bluntly that this will be very serious, difficult, and perhaps in places even contradictory work, because we will by all accounts have differing approaches here. The leadership of the Supreme Soviet, and Boris Nikolayevich Yeltsin, at his meeting with Comrade Kryuchkov, expressed the thought that we think that the Russian KGB, in spite of its Union-republican subordination, should have sufficiently extensive and serious independence, and its main work lies in guaranteeing the interests of Russian....

[Nosovets, interrupting] The sovereignty of Russia.

[Stepashin] The sovereignty of the Russian Federation. So, in order that this should truly not be a camouflage job, not a change of wrapper, as they say, of one committee for another, but a serious organ, this is something we also have to bear in mind. I will say bluntly that Comrade Kryuchkov also supported this thought in general, and moreover I am personally impressed by his remark where he said that the KGB of the Russian Federation should be fundamentally different from all the existing committees of the Union republics. For Russia is the largest state, or republic, within the framework of the Union undergoing renewal. Russia is a multinational state; Russia has an immense number of problems, including interethnic ones, and other kinds of problems.

[Nosovets] And in the final analysis, its territory, its borders.

[Stepashin] Immense territory. Borders shared with other states, 85 percent of the military industrial complex, of the budget—and so, of course, in this situation our organs should be fundamentally—functionally, organizationally, and structurally—different from those which currently exist in the other Union republics. The third factor—also in my view quite fundamental today: We understand very well that, as they say, he who pays the piper calls the tune—that is the question of the budget, on which our security committee will now be living. Due to the fact that the budget for 1991 was formulated last year, we know we are fumbling presently with a very serious emergency budget, and the problem is very difficult. For this reason a joint accord was also reached—and moreover, in quite a constructive dialogue—that in 1991, this year, the RSFSR KGB will be funded from the budget of the USSR KGB, the Union budget. Our funds also go toward that, so I think everything in this sense is OK. Concerning next year, 1992, and subsequent years, this question will soon, I think, following the adoption of a law on security and a law on the RSFSR KGB.... [changes thought] And by the way, very active work is currently being conducted on these documents in our committee, and in June we are submitting them for the decision of the Supreme Soviet. Here, by all accounts, together with the Russian Council of Ministers, we will make provision for an article on a budget allocation for the maintenance of our committee.

[Nosovets] Well, the actual fact of the transfer of local administrations, departments, and organs of the KGB certainly merits the highest appreciation. But at the same time a mass of problems arises, because these territorial subdivisions have to be dealt with, in the final analysis, and you are probably posing the question of the expediency of extending these structures to one region or another, one town or another—the question of their personnel.

[Stepashin] Quite so. This is, perhaps, not a question for today, nor for this week or this month. For the time being we have resolved one issue, perhaps a purely technical one—the transfer of these adminstrations to our jurisdiction. With concern to personnel appointments, and the structure, functions, and tasks that I have not spoken of yet—all of this has to be incorporated into the blueprint for security that we are working on, and into the law on the organs of the RSFSR KGB that we will also be adopting, I repeat, in the very near future. Another issue, and I want to talk about this right away because by all accounts I am being watched and listened to by the staff of the USSR KGB who have now already become the staff of the committee of the Russian Federation—we have no intention of carrying out any purges of 1917 and subsequent years. I am firmly convinced that these meetings we have had with many officers, generals of the KGB—that among them the majority are decent, honest, and highly professional people, people who are ready and willing to serve the Constitution, their people and fatherland, and not the interests of any party or of any leaders and their ambitions.

So in this regard the question of personnel appointments, the question of selecting and appointing personnel, will be addressed on the basis of this principled standpoint of ours. By the way, I would like to say right away that we have now reached an agreement in principle with the leadership of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation, that at the end of this month, evidently immediately after the congress, here at the House of Soviets we will be holding the first meeting of the leadership of the RSFSR KGB and the leadership of the Supreme Soviet and Council of Ministers of the RSFSR with all of the leaders of the territorial administrations of the KGB of our Union republics, autonomous formations, and oblasts. This will be a first meeting, a meeting for getting to know each other, a meeting for exchanging experience, a meeting for elaborating joint platforms, joint approaches—a meeting for advice and for seeking further ways in the constructive work of our new state security committee.

[Nosovets] Sergey Vadimovich, you said that our committee will not serve the interests of any parties. This is a natural process for the politics of Russia—after all, our president will also be without party allegiance from the moment of his election. But it is now common knowledge, unfortunately, that the USSR KGB has to a large extent been protecting the interests of a party, the CPSU. To what extent—perhaps it is too early to speak of this now, but to what extent is there any sign presently of, say, the depoliticization, the dismantling of party influence in our KGB organs?

[Stepashin] Well, with concern to whose interests have been protected by the USSR KGB, that is something of an academic question, because we probably have to acknowledge that the CPSU in our country was for a long period of time not so much a party, but the most serious state structure, engaged in all external, internal, economic, and political issues—and so this linkage was entirely natural. Today is another matter. Concerning the question you asked directly about the dismantling of party influence in the organs of the KGB—and by the way, this question was asked the day before yesterday of Comrade Ivanenko, here at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet—he replied like this, and....

[Nosovets, interrupting] Who is Comrade Ivanenko?

[Stepashin] He is the acting chairman of the RSFSR KGB. I will tell you literally a few words about this man, and about what occurred here the day before yesterday at the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet. I agree with him when he replied in literally the following way to the question: If the Russian Supreme Soviet—and this is its prerogative—adopts a law, and we know that such a law is already in the pipeline, on the dismantling of party influence in state organs and establishments, including the organs of the RSFSR KGB, then as a man who will as his sacred duty serve the Constitution and laws of the Russian Federation he will accept this as what is proper. I think that standpoint is entirely correct and proper.

[Nosovets] The fact that such a law is currently in the pipeline is in itself a reply to this question. Certainly it is not the fault of the majority of the KGB staff, of course, that this organ still enjoys a reputation as a repressive organ. What efforts still have to be made so that our Russian KGB does not have such a bad reputation?

[Stepashin] Well, this depends to a large extent on the leadership of the Supreme Soviet, on the future president, on us, the people's deputies, and on deputies at all levels. I would like to mention just two points. First, this is the third time I have brought up this law on security we are currently preparing, the blueprint. In the preamble there, and in the first article, we put the following as the main thing: that the main aim and task of the organs of the RSFSR KGB lie in the protection of the rights, dignity, and honor of the individual, based on the Declaration on Human Rights and based on our Constitution. Only subsequently the Constitution, state interests, sovereignty, and so on—not the other way around, as it used to be, and continues to be in many existing structures. That is the first point. The second point—this is, of course, rigorous legislative supervision. Today, at least, you know that our Supreme Soviet committee was actually engaged in selecting personnel and in preparing the signing of the protocol. At the focus of our attention are, indeed, questions connected with the territories. I think that exactly such work should without fail be conducted by all elected organs of people's deputies of towns, oblasts, and our autonomous okrugs. Herein lies the division of powers of which we have spoken so much, but which we have not attained as yet.

[Nosovets] The question arises: What, then, is the fate, or what other form or structure is there for our state committee for defense and security?

[Stepashin] Yes, this is a totally fair question. At the last Presidium of the RSFSR Supreme Soviet this question was examined, and the Presidium unanimously supported the position taken by our committee—a brief report was actually given by me—that the committee in question is now divided into two committees: the state committee for defense matters, headed by Colonel (Konstantin Ivanovich Nerov), our people's deputy, and the actual Committee for State Security of the Russian Federation. I imagine that from the legal point of view, and from the legislative point of view, and from the point of view of simple common sense and logic, this decision is absolutely correct. At this same Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, also at our suggestion, the acting—I stress again, acting—chairman of the RSFSR KGB was made Viktor Valentinovich Ivanenko, former deputy head of the inspectorial administration of the USSR KGB, who was made major-general a week ago. This candidacy was also made by us; it went through quite serious interviews, meetings with the leadership of the Supreme Soviet, and in general this is a man who, today, in the work on the protocol, and in the specific work on dividing the functions of the KGB which is under way, has shown himself a serious, thoughtful, honest, and decent officer who, I believe, can do a great deal for the benefit of the RSFSR KGB. Concerning the chairman of the KGB, in the present situation the question remains open, and I think that we will be returning to this candidacy in perhaps two or three months' time.

[Nosovets] Well, another step has thus been taken toward the real protection of Russia's sovereignty, and toward the real restoration of Russia's statehood. Next come further steps.

Cossack Atamans Discuss Chechen-Ingush Violence

PM0905115991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 9 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[Report by Aleksandr Davydov: "Cossack Ataman Prepared To Take His Own Measures"]

[Text] Moscow—The situation which has taken shape in Chechen-Ingushetia around the Cossack settlements has been denounced by an emergency lesser council of the country's Cossack atamans.

Addressing a news conference on the results of the two days of sessions, A. Martynov, the ataman of the Cossacks Union, stated that the 28 April murder of five cossacks, including a local ataman, is in the nature of an act of political provocation. The leader of the Cossacks Union stressed that the reprisal (threats to perpetrate it had issued from persons of Ingush nationality previously) continued with the connivance of the internal affairs organs for about 10 hours and were in the nature of an overt pogrom.

The council of atamans sent an appeal to the country's leadership noting that despite the explosive situation to this day the measures envisaged by the law have not been taken and that is fraught with the danger of new outbreaks of violence. The appeal contains a demand that a state of emergency be introduced in the region of the conflict and that USSR Internal Affairs Ministry units be formed from volunteer Cossacks to guard Cossack settlements. Answering a question about what the reaction of the Cossacks Union will be if the proposals of the council of atamans are not implemented, A. Martynov stated: "Then we will take our own measures."

At the request of the Cossack atamans USSR Vice President G. Yanayev and Russian Soviet Federal Socialist Republic Supreme Soviet Chairman B. Isayev met with them 7 May.

'Expropriators' of Unused Land Moved Against

PM0905135391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 8 May 91 Union Edition p 2

["Direct Line" report by Sergey Krayukhin: "Empty Plots of Land Being Grabbed"]

[Text] Leningrad—Not so long ago the inhabitants of Leningrad could read slogans in the city center which said: "Grab the empty plots of land and plant vegetables. The land is no man's land...." Evidently, in accordance with such appeals, or maybe exclusively on their own initiative, citizens in Kirovskiy and other rayons in Leningrad Oblast seriously decided that the uncultivated lands really did not belong to anyone and people could do what they liked with them. In any case they started resourcefully taking sizeable plots of land into their own hands, that is, into private ownership.

Concerned with such a turn of events, the Leningrad Oblast Soviet, as its press center made known, decided to stamp out such activity and remind people of the possible serious consequences. Active expropriators have been unequivocally told that existing legislation stipulates concrete criminal liability for willful seizure of land and unauthorized construction on plots of land. Only local soviets of people's deputies and their executive committees are granted the right to allocate plots of land.

Ivanovo City Executive Committee Resigns

PM0805102591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 7 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[TASS Report: "Entire Leadership Resigns"]

[Text] Executive power has been paralyzed in Ivanovo City. The city soviet executive committee in the shape of the chairman and his three deputies has resigned.

Those who have handed in their resignation motivate it by the impossibility of controling the situation and halting the collapse in the economy and the social sphere under present conditions and by the reluctance to be scapegoats.

Considering the situation which has taken shape, a session of the city soviet of people's deputies accepted the resignation of the executive committee leadership and has assigned the duties of head of executive power to the city soviet chairman for a temporary period extending no further than 1 July, TASS has reported.

Western Republics

Ukraine's Kravchuk on Relations With Center

PM1005152991 Moscow MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI in Russian No 16, 21 Apr 91 p 6

[Interview with Ukranian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk by Yegor Yakovlev in Moscow; date not given; under the "Conversation with Chief Editor" rubric: "Do Not Force a Break"—first two paragraphs are MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI introduction]

[Text] Ukranian Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk is the guest of MOSKOVSKIYE NOVOSTI today.

He was born into a peasant family in Rovno Oblast in 1934. His father died at the front. He graduated from a commercial technical college and later from Kiev University's Department of Political Economy. In 1970 he defended a dissertation at the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Sciences on a very unfashionable subject for that time—"The Role of Profit Under Socialism." Then he worked at the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee. Last July he was elected chairman of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet, being second secretary of the Ukrainian Communist Party Central Committee.

[Yakovlev] We are meeting at a time when society has arrived at a unanimous opinion, albeit on just one issue: The country is in a catastrophic situation.

[Kravchuk] Yes, regarding assessments of the situation, their "temperature" is rising steadily. Some five years ago it was being said that the stagnation times had brought the country to the verge of a crisis and that perestroyka would deliver us from it. Later a claim emerged: The country was slipping into a crisis. True, it was not very clear where this crisis had originated. Next, if you follow the way it was put, we were on the crest of a crisis, and soon after in a profound crisis. Finally, at the last session of the Federation Council, the president reported that the country was sliding toward a catastrophe.

[Yakovlev] At the same time he remarked: "I do not intend now to analyze the reasons for this situation." This is presumably the most painful topic. Against the background of our constant backward motion the president is talking increasingly frequently about the mistakes made in recent years. Yet he avoids speaking about the reasons for them. In other words, it is proposed to treat the patient without first making a diagnosis.

[Kravchuk] Very likely. Both the disintegration of the economy and the destruction of institutions of power were mentioned at the Federation Council session, separated by a comma. Of course, these two phenomena are linked, but nonetheless each of them has its own causes.

The economic crisis entails not only a danger of death but also a possibility of improvement, since it has come about as a result of the transition from the administrative edict system to the market. This is a case where birth is not possible without death, and the death of the old must be assisted. The reverse is happening: Obsolete structures are being preserved and maintained. At the same time there is a total lack of management just of the emergent institutions—cooperatives, leasing, etc. The laws that are being adopted do not, as a rule, create conditions for their development. Even if a law is quite good, the local bodies of power frequently do not permit its realization.

As for the political crisis and the aforementioned disintegration of power, of course the destruction of the Union is a factor here. Some republics are breaking with it, while others, including the Ukraine, have adopted declarations of state sovereignty. While not accepting the Union that existed, nonetheless the Ukraine does not seek to leave it. Only there is no need here to frighten people by saying that the Ukraine will not survive on its own! It is another matter that we are interested in preserving historically evolved ties. True, not everything depends on us. If Russia, let us say, were to introduce its own currency or begin forming its own army tommorrow, what would happen to the Ukraine?

Yet it is possible to preserve the Union if it is not always identified with the Union state and if the center accepts the formula of sovereign states, but it has essentially rejected it. The draft Union treaty formally proclaims in its first lines a Union of sovereign states, but then, touching on ownership, taxes, and the structure of political power, it rejects it. Voices are already being heard to say: Can there be states within a state?

It is known that the chief idea which was to have been enshrined in the Union treaty—incidentally, this was the president's idea—was the demarcation of the powers of the center and the republics. It was to this, above all, that all the preparatory work was devoted. But now, at the last Federation Council session, I suddenly hear that it is necessary first to sign the treaty and then to begin delimiting the functions of Union and republic organizations. Here, whether you want to or not, you begin to perceive something preplanned. If the USSR Supreme Soviet creates new ministries every day, there is an undoubted consistency in this—at any rate in the fact that we say one thing but do something else. What will this cabinet tackle? Again the whole country? They want to take us back to the former centralized state, and it is for this that these ministries and departments are being created. Is this possible when everyone in the Ukraine realizes that today we have maybe the only chance in history to make our motherland a real, independent state with full rights? What could be loftier than this goal? Today it is possible to rally the people around this goal alone.

[Yakovlev] Nevertheless, at a recent sitting of the Federation Council there was a proposal to immediately restore the vertical coordination of the executive from top to bottom.

[Kravchuk] Had it been said that it is necessary for the transitional period to restore vertical links within the framework of the powers of the center, that would have been understandable. They are proposing something else—to make the Ukrainian Council of Ministers subordinate on all questions to the Union Cabinet, as it used to be. We appoint our government ourselves; it is accountable to us. If we really want partnership, not only the Supreme Soviets of the republics but also the USSR Supreme Soviet should renounce at least for a time the rubber-stamping of laws that often contradict republican laws. At the moment there is just one issue: The republics must renounce their laws. As though the only imperfect laws are those adopted at local level and everything written in Union laws and presidential decrees is absolutely ideal. What is there for us to do then? Does anyone seriously think that the peoples of the republics will repudiate previously adopted declarations on state sovereignty? Who would dare to propose such a thing?

[Yakovlev] This would probably be the last proposal.

[Kravchuk] Undoubtedly.

[Yakovlev] Does it not seem to you that we constantly return to the same point—to the political conflict of our times, the conflict between the inevitable development of life and the desire of the founders of perestroyka to keep it within the limits which they set for it?

[Kravchuk] We have not learned how to pay tribute to the established laws of life. We strive to keep everything in our own hands, including objective laws, but no one has succeeded there. Life today urges us on and pressures us—there is no letup in the rallies, no end to the strikes, and many people, clearly seeing their salvation in this, switch to thinking in conventional ways—the way it worked 15 years ago. I would like to make another comment on the recent Federation Council session. There, as in the past, the republics were blamed for everything: It was said that they have not made their contribution to the Union budget. The speakers were ministers, people well trained in economics, and none of them said that the budget deficit was predetermined. The increased wholesale prices began operating from the beginning of the year, but the new retail prices only started on 2 April and the republic budgets have had no revenue.

[Yakovlev] Nevertheless, the president has stated that the republics are plundering the Union budget.

[Kravchuk] You will understand how I felt when I heard this, since I know that the Ukraine has contributed as much as it can. Furthermore, we showed our calculations to USSR Finance Minister Vladimir Orlov. He agreed: The Ukraine cannot contribute more to the Union budget at present. He even signed the relevant document with us. He said something completely different at the Federation Council in the president's presence: The republic is to blame. I just do not understand that.

[Yakovlev] Where is the way out of the crisis? The idea of a roundtable and the creation of a government of national confidence has been mooted several times; Russia has supported it.

[Kravchuk] The roundtable idea, it seems to me, currently amounts to talks between Russia and the center. How are we to affiliate to this? What role is assigned to us—one of conciliation and affiliation? Meanwhile, the "500 days program," whether it was better or worse, was defeated precisely because it was created primarily between the center and Russia. If the roundtable begins from the same point, it will develop not into ways to save the country but how to reconcile Gorbachev and Yeltsin once more.

[Yakovlev] There is to be a CPSU Central Committee plenum in a few days. Some party organizations, demanding its convening, believe that the party should not bear responsibility for the mistakes of the country's leadership, in other words, they are pressing for the general secretary's resignation. The "Soyuz" deputies group is also trying to secure Gorbachev's resignation, but from the post of president. Would Gorbachev's replacement help extricate the country from crisis?

[Kravchuk] This is intolerable right now. Troubled times have already begun and if in addition a struggle for power at the top begins as well, disasters will be inevitable. It can be predicted that this could mark the beginning of a new departure in society's development—but not along the path of deepening democracy. This is frightening.

[Yakovlev] Hopes are being pinned on the Federation Council, but history reminds us of the "Seven Boyars" period.

[Kravchuk] Searching for a new figure is the same as searching for a better tsar. Let us suppose that we find someone else. To start with, some things may calm down, but a few months later everything will start up again with renewed force. Is it just a matter of Gorbachev? When Anatoliy Lukyanov chairs a Supreme Soviet session and adopts laws, it sometimes seems to me that he does not even suspect that republics with their own legal legislatures exist. No, nothing will change if a single person is replaced.

We need to start really dividing up power functions. Otherwise any strengthening of executive authority in the upper echelons will produce nothing. This will naturally require us to make substantive changes to institutions of power from top to bottom, and to the principles behind their formation.

[Yakovlev] In recent years our life has been more and more reminiscent of living on a raft of snow. Some people are running to the left, others to the right, others are running and even shooting, but the snow is steadily picking up speed and an avalanche looms. Perhaps such a crisis is still ahead, we have not reached the point yet where we can start moving up, we have not touched bottom. It often seemed that we had bottomed out, but—as the satirist noted—when we touched bottom we heard knocking from below.

[Kravchuk] I hear what you are saying, and I am constantly thinking about it. Will we see a repetition in our country of what happened in Eastern Europe—a straight break instead of evolutionary development? If this happens, the casualties and losses will be incalculable. But I believe in our people's wisdom. They will resolve everything properly.

[Yakovlev] Can you give any guarantee that what happened recently in Minsk will not soon happen in Kiev?

[Kravchuk] There are no guarantees—I can say that quite frankly. The population's dissatisfaction today is ultimately expressed in the single formula: We must not reduce the market merely to price hikes. When we signed the agreement on prices it was supposed that other programs would operate: the inclusion of additional resources, credits, a real system of protection for people. It all boiled down to price increases; furthermore, people producing the goods that are now several times dearer are still getting the same pay. Is this really a market? No, it is another economic misunderstanding.

[Yakovlev] What is the way out?

[Kravchuk] I see real salvation in only one area: The president must give the republics greater opportunities and we will take greater responsibility. A great many of the things currently troubling us—the endless delays, agreements, and the "war of laws"—would stop overnight. Yes, the center would have less power and the Union minister would not be the master in our land. Why should he be? Why should the president issue me with a decree on agriculture, say? Are we in the Ukraine really incapable of deciding what to do? I am even ashamed to show my face outdoors these days. People ask me why things that were decided on have not been done. I reply that there is nothing I can do, the division of powers has not happened yet. "So when will it?" they ask.

[Yakovlev] Today you are head of the Ukraine and you are inevitably facing the question of what to do in the future.

[Kravchuk] There is nothing for it but to find the answer ourselves.

[Yakovlev] This, however, will lead to even greater confrontation with the center.

[Kravchuk] So what? We will have to assemble all our political forces here in the Supreme Soviet and say: The time has come, guys. Let us all sort this out ourselves.

[Yakovlev] There is probably one obvious conclusion to come out of our conversation: You are continually being forced into a break with the center.

[Kravchuk] We have been for a long time. But we are taking a sober view of the situation and thinking not of ourselves but of millions of people, of how to avoid a confrontation whose consequences could be very serious.

Ukrainian Deputy Released From Remand

LD1205194691 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1755 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS-UKRINFORM correspondent Stanislav Volnyanskiy]

[Text] Kiev, 12 May—At the request of the Ukrainian Supreme Soviet Presidium, the republic's Supreme Court has made a decision to alter the restraining measure against people's deputy Stepan Khmara and has released him from custody in a Kiev remand cell prior to the court's verdict. The Ukrainian legislature gave its consent to the commencement of a criminal case against him and his arrest on 12 November last year after the republic's procurator presented facts about the deputy's unlawful actions, in particular, his participation in the beating and robbing of a militia colonel.

This morning Ukraine Supreme Soviet Chairman Leonid Kravchuk told deputies that the Presidium had applied to the highest judicial authority in the republic requesting Stepan Khmara's release prior to his trial. Nevertheless, the legislative opposition, the People's Council [Narodna Rada], refused to take part in the work of the Supreme Soviet session until a reply had been received and left the session hall.

At the evening session People's Council Chairman Igor Yukhnovskiy thanked the Supreme Soviet Presidium for its application and called on the opposition to continue working in the legislature.

Moldovan National Front Holds Rally in Kishenev

LD1105004991 Moscow Central Television First Program Network in Russian 2110 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] MOLDOVA-PRESS reports that a rally of the Moldovan National Front took place in Kishinev today. Valeriy Matey, vice chairman of the Front, stated that the center essentially has declared economic war on Moldova, and is continuing to support separatist-minded leaders. He noted that it is necessary that a package of laws guaranteeing Moldova's genuine independence be adopted at the forthcoming session of the Supreme Soviet of the Republic.

Moldovan First Deputy Premier on Crisis Plans

LD1105111491 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 0700 GMT 11 May 91

[Interview with Veleriy Fedorovich Muravsky, first deputy prime minister of Moldova, by Mikhail Sakirko in Kishinev; date not given—recorded]

[Text] A program for emerging from the crisis has been considered at a session of the Government of the Republic of Moldova.

[Muravskiy] The government of the republic in its search for a solution for a way out of the crisis considered at its session a program of emergency measures that will be presented for consideration at the next session of the republican legislature. I would like to give a brief account of the main points of this program.

In the first place, it is absolutely clear that there is no way other than that of economic reform and a transition to market relations. In this connection, the program foresees a complex of measures on speeding up the transition to the market. I would say that the transition to the market, in my view, is based on three major things: privatization, liberalization of prices, and index linking of incomes. Already this year, in line with this program, we should start a process of privatization, a process of liberalizaton of prices, and accordingly a process of index linking of incomes. This is one direction. The second direction that concerns us—and appropriate measures are expected—is a matter of increasing the effectiveness of executive power. Unfortunately, we should admit that executive power does not work at various levels today. So, in our view, strengthening executive power from the republican government to local soviets should have some effect.

What is planned in this direction? First, the elimination of presidia and rayon city soviets, and the transfer of all power to executive committees, giving them full responsibility for the territory's socio economic development. For this purpose there will be further decentralization of the budget with the transfer of incomes and expenses of the territory to local authorities. The question of decentralizing capital investments will be considered—that is, it will not be Kishinev that plans what project and where, in which village or in which rayon, will be constructed. Limits and financial and material possibilities that are available today will be placed at the disposal of local authorities. Let them build what they think necessary. Third, the transfer of bodies of material and technical supply to their subordination and under their management. The third main direction is the strengthening of financial and montary circulation.

The last thing I would like to say is the strengthening of dicipline and order; otherwise, it would be difficult to implement all the rest without this factor. For this purpose we particularly stress strengthening financial bodies and tax inspection. A law on tax inspection will be considered in the legislature. We will tighten up the demands imposed on violators of financial legislation, and we will also increase material and legal provisions for workers in financial bodies.

Caucasus

Azerbaijan-Armenia Border Area Described

Still 'Tense' 8-10 May

LD1105125791 Moscow TASS in English 1223 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 11 TASS—The situation in the Azerbaijani-Armenian border areas and in the Nagorno-Karabakh autonomous region ramained tense on May 8-10. Despite a statement by the Presidium of the Armenian parliament about strict observance of legality, illegal actions continued.

The press centre of the USSR Interior Ministry reports that unidentified people fired a shot from a grenade-launcher on the building of the Azerbaijani Communist Party regional committee in Stepanakert on May 10.

The grenade exploded in an office where there were senior officials of the republican organising committee of the region, as well as of regional law enforcement bodies and the Interior Ministry task force.

It wounded Second Secretary of the Republican Communist Party Central Committee V. Polyanichko and a representative of Soviet interior troops' command.

Nine troops were wounded near the village of Tatly, Kazakh district, from Armenia during a shootout.

Law enforcement bodies are taking measures to fulfill the presidential decree of July 25, 1990 to ensure security of the population in the region. Great quantities of firearms, guns and military hardware were seized during measures to disarm illegal armed groups.

For instance, 29 firearms, including 19 submachine-guns were seized in the community of Bashkend in the Kedabek district, Azerbaijan.

Area 'Relatively Quiet'

PM1205131591 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 11 May 91 Union Edition p 2

[S. Mostovshchikov report: "Armenian-Azerbaijani Border: Situation Has Stabilized, but Shooting Continues"]

[Text] Judging by the summary of operations, passed to IZVESTIYA by the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] on the morning of 10 May, the Armenian-Azerbaijani border has been relatively quiet for the past two days. According to Colonel General Yuriy Shatalin, commander of the USSR MVD Internal Troops, "nothing special has been happening," apart from nighttime shooting and isolated attacks on servicemen which the commander has long viewed as routine.

The USSR MVD summary contains information about the firing at the guest house in Stepanakert where officers of Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] commandant's office live. It is also reported that eight people armed with automatic weapons and dressed in militia uniforms seized six Armenians working in a field near Norshen village in NKAO's Martuninskiy Rayon 8 May. The latter were taken away in the direction of the Azerbaijani village of Gyulabaly....

According to Yuriy Shatalin, Armenian fighters attacked the guard of the Soviet Army's radiotechnical battalion in Kumayri during the night from 9 to 10 May. Fourteen automatic weapons were seized.

IZVESTIYA has also received a report from Yerevan by its own correspondent Sergey Bablumyan. He reports that the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium has published a statement in which the events taking place in a number of villages in Azerbaijan until recently inhabited by Armenians are qualified as aggression. The same applies to the actions of the Soviet Army and USSR MVD Internal Troops in Armenian rayons bordering on Azerbaijan.

The statement demands that the legality of the armed forces' actions be strictly observed and that they not be allowed to exceed their powers. The question of the release of all hostages, prisoners, and unlawfully arrested people is also raised.

Armenian journalists have expressed a decisive protest in connection with the capture of their collague Vartan Oganesyan, a free-lance photo-correspondent of the Armenian section of IAN. It has transpired that he was arrested in the course of his duties in Getashen village in Azerbaijan 6 May.

According to Migran Nazaretyan, Armenian minister of health, the fate of the Yerevan surgeons Gevork Grigoryan and Valeriy Khachatryan, sent on a duty tour to Getashen to assist casualties, is not known either.

On 9 May Ashot Manucharyan, Armenian acting minister of internal affairs, gave a press conference for Soviet and foreign journalists. He drew attention in particular to the fact that staffers of the Armenian internal affairs organs are the main victims of the violence on the part of military subunits. The following figures were cited: Of the 14 Armenians killed over 2 days in border rayons, 11 served in the militia, and of the 73 hostages, 69 are staffers of law enforcement organs. In this connection the Armenian MVD has lodged a resolute protest with Boris Pugo, USSR minister of internal affairs.

...And the final report: Having completed their mission in Armenia, the group of Russian deputies left for Tbilisi to fly to Baku from there.

'Quiet' Overnight 12 May

LD1305092391 Moscow Radio Moscow World Service in English 0800 GMT 13 May 91

[Text] Last night passed in a relative quiet in the zone of interethnic conflict on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan. There've been other hopeful reports. On Sunday there was a telephone conversation between the prime ministers of these two Caucasian republics. They discussed in particular the issue of negotiations. The venue for the talks may be either the city of Tbilisi or the resort city of Sochi.

NKAO Situation, Arms Confiscation Noted

LD1005171391 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1538 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondents Vadim Byrkin and Vladimir Gondujov]

[Text] Stepanakert, 10 May (TASS)—A train arrived last night at the railway station in Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast [NKAO] after a two-week break. It was carrying ballast and sand, however, instead of goods which are so much needed by the population. Meanwhile, there is enough flour in Stepanakert to last one day. Other foodstuffs are also in short supply.

There is shooting every night in the region, where order and stability are disrupted by the Armenian-Azerbaijani inter-ethnic conflict. Servicemen of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs return fire at armed criminals. There were no casualties last night.

The exchange of hostages planned for midday today in Martuninskiy Rayon of the NKAO has not taken place. The seven Armenians and one Azerbaijani seized earlier are being held as before by the sides. Negotiations on the liberation of hostages are proceeding with the participation of the military.

Your TASS correspondents were informed in the commandant's office of the emergency region that the confiscation of arms and ammunition being held illegally is continuing in the NKAO and bordering rayons of the Azerbaijan Republic. This afternoon Internal Troops discovered approximately 20 artillery shells under an automobile bridge near the town of Martuni, thanks to a message received from local inhabitants. In all likelihood, the arsenal was intended to blow up the road. Without delay, sappers cleared the bridge of mines.

Troops Surround Another Armenian Village

NC1105083391 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 1745 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] Paravakar village in Tavushskiy Rayon has been under siege since this morning. Scores of tanks and armored cars are firing into the streets from the hills overlooking the village. Military helicopters are bombing the village from the air. The village was also fired upon with Katyusha missiles.

In the afternoon, the leaders of the village handed over the hunting guns of the men on watch to the troops. However, the troops were not satisfied with this and took Vache Krutyan, chairman of the village soviet, and Engineer Samuel Krutyan as hostages. In return for the hostages they demanded that the imaginary bandits in the village hand over their guns.

General Andreyev, chief of the Investigation Department of the USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, is conducting the military operations. He has given a deadline and has warned that unless his demands are met he will raze the village to the ground.

Grenade Fired at Stepanakert Commandant's Office

LD1005195791 Moscow TASS in English 1938 GMT 10 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Vladimir Gondusov]

[Text] Stepanakert May 10 TASS—At 20:05 today unidentified persons fired from a grenade thrower at the building in the centre of Stepanakert housing the commandant's office of the district with state of emergency and the organising committee for Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Region of Azerbaijan.

The grenade exploded in the office where USSR People's Deputy V. Polyanichko, second secretary of the Azerbaijani Communist Party and chairman of the republican organising committee for Nagorno-Karabakh was present. Luckily, he was not hurt.

Polyanichko told TASS that this was the fourth attempt on his life.

Units of Soviet Interior Ministry forces are conducting an investigation to find those who had staged the act of terrorism.

Armenian Supreme Soviet's Activities Reported

Protests Army, KGB Actions

LD1005125291 Moscow TASS in English 1235 GMT 10 May 91

[Text] Moscow May 10 TASS—The Presidium of the Armenian parliament, in a statement issued today, expressed concern over the fate of residents from the republic's villages bordering on Azerbaijan, "who were arrested during combat actions", a TASS correspondent reported from Yerevan.

In the judgement of the Armenian parliament Presidium, "the Soviet Army and Interior Ministry troops perform actions which are impermissible even under state-of-emergency conditions".

Acting on the strength of the presidential decree dated July 25, 1990, Interior Ministry troops, the KGB and the USSR Defence Ministry forces take measures to disarm unlawful groups in the zone of the inter-ethnic conflict on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border, USSR Interior Minister Boris Pugo told the central parliament on Tuesday.

As a result of the actions, arms, ammunition and combat hardware were seized or destroyed, the USSR Interior Ministry reported.

Today's statement by the Armenian parliament Presidium asserts that there are proofs that of the use of tortures against arrested Armenians to wrest false testimony that would confirm the official version about "Armenian militants." [sentence as received]

The Presidium demanded that Soviet Armed Forces and the central authorities "release all hostages, detainees and unlawfully arrested people" and give data on the fate of those who were reported missing.

In Yerevan, the Armenian Communist Party (ACP) Central Committee issued an address to the Soviet Communist Party (CPSU) Central Committee, insisting that an extraordinary meeting of the Politburo of the CPSU Central Committee be held to discuss the situation in the region.

In the opinion of the ACP Communist Party [as received] Central Committee, "there is a mounting wave of anti-Russian and anti-army sentiments in the republic".

At the same time, according to a dispatch received today from a TASS correspondent in Baku, President Ayaz Mutalibov of Azerbaijan, when receiving two Western correspondents, pointed out with satisfaction "that the leadership of the Union is performing its constitutional duty to the people of Azerbaijan, ensuring the defence of the republic's sovereignty and territorial integrity".

Describing tension in the region, Mutalibov said that "the patience of the Azerbaijani people, drawn into a war unleashed by Armenian separatists, has run out".

Deputies To Visit Region

NC1105084691 Yerevan Domestic Service in Armenian 0600 GMT 11 May 91

[From the review of HAYASTANI HANRAPETUTYUN]

[Text] The paper has published a report on its front page about the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium meeting on 10 May chaired by Levon Ter-Petrosyan, chairman of the Armenian Republic Supreme Soviet. He briefed the meeting on the latest developments along Armenia's border, Nagorno-Karabakh, and Shaumyanovskiy Rayon, and about (?efforts) to secure the release of citizens taken hostage by the army.

Taking into account the general situation, the Supreme Soviet Presidium deemed it appropriate to send groups of deputies to all the regions of the republic to organize relevant work on the spot. The deputies will meet individuals and work collectives and will brief them about the republic leadership's work in this complex situation. In turn, the deputies will get acquainted with the situation in the regions.

It was also decided to reconvene the regular sitting of the second session of the first convocation of the Supreme Soviet (?20-22) May.

Other issues pertaining to the situation on the borders and to the political and economic life of the republic were also examined.

Protests Arrests

PM1305091591 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 11 May 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report under general heading: "Situation in Transcaucasus"]

[Text] Yerevan—The Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium has issued a statement expressing alarm and concern at the fate of the inhabitants of the republic's villages bordering on Azerbaijan who have been arrested during hostilities.

As is well known, the forces of the MVD [Ministry of Foreign Affairs], KGB, and USSR Defense Ministry are carrying out measures to disarm illegal formations in the zone of the interethnic conflict on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border, acting on the basis of the USSR president's decree of 25 July last year.

In the opinion of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium, the document states, "the Soviet Army and internal troops are carrying out actions not permitted even under the conditions of a state of emergency." The statement contains a demand to the Soviet Armed Forces and central authorities "to immediately halt the aggression against the Armenian people," to strictly observe the legality of operation of the Armed Forces, and "to prevent them from exceeding their powers." They must "free all hostages, prisoners, and those arrested illegally" and give reliable information about the fate of those who have gone missing. In the opinion of the Armenian Supreme Soviet Presidium, "the competent Union and international bodies" must investigate the events that have taken place.

Armenia Protests 'Military Aggression' to UN

LD1105173591 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] Karyun Khumaryan, our Yerevan correspondent, reports that a declaration by the Republic of Armenia's Foreign Ministry was published in Yerevan today. The Republic of Armenia's Foreign Ministry considers the military actions against Armenia and her people to be a flagrant breach of the fundamental principles of the UN Charter, as well as of UN Security Council Resolution 688, the declaration reads. The Republic of Armenia's Foreign Ministry expresses its protest against the military aggression and appeals to representatives of international organizations, primarily the United Nations, to visit the aggression zone, to acquaint themselves with the actual situation, and to come out in favor of ending violence and restoring peace and stability in the region. The Armenian Foreign Ministry declaration has been sent to the UN Security Council; the UN Human Rights Center, in Geneva; the UN High Commissioner for Refugees; the International Court, in The Hague; and the foreign ministries of the USSR republics.

Armenian Official Says Situation 'Relatively Calm'

NC1205073991 Yerevan Radio Yerevan Network in Armenian 1730 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] How is the situation in our republic's border regions today? What is being done to secure the return of the hostages? Andranik Kocharyan, first deputy minister of internal affairs, answered these questions:

[Begin Kocharyan recording] The situation was relatively calm yesterday and today, except for a few provocative incidents. For example, at 0700 today, 20 paratroopers landed in the forest in Noyemberyanskiy Rayon from the direction of [name indistinct] village in the same rayon. The Noyemberyan radio station announced at 1013 that the antihail guns near the village were blown up.

The Internal Affairs Ministry patrols in Araratskiy Rayon reported at 0834 that the troops stationed at the Yerevan-Yeraskh military guard post have left for an undisclosed location. First (?the troops) reconnoitered the antihail sites. Then the paratrooper detachments landed, blew up the guns, and disappeared.

For the time being, the situation in the border zone extending from the north to Gorisskiy Rayon is calm. We are worried most now about the fate of the hostages. Two days ago they [not further identified] released only five people. Despite their promise to release most of the hostages [words indistinct], it appears that they will not release the hostages all at once. They will do it slowly to get on our nerves. They hope that we will constantly appeal to them, and they will release the hostages in stages. I think that they will eventually release the hostages. However, our press, the public, and the government must constantly pressure them to release the hostages. [end recording]

Armenian Leader Urges Karabakh Autonomy

LD1205173991 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1600 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] A news conference was given for Soviet and foreign journalists in Yerevan today by Vazgen Manukyan, chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Republic of Armenia. Our correspondent Koryun Khumaryan will tell us about it.

[Khumaryan] It seems to me that this news conference differed somewhat both in tone and content from previous ones. Beginning the press conference, the chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers noted that it has been relatively calm over the past two days on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan. He then made a detailed examination of the three versions existing in Armenia regarding the latest surge of tension in Getashen, Shaumyanovsk Rayon, the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast, and on Armenia's border with Azerbaijan. Replying to a question from a journalist as to whether contentious problems exist on the border, which give rise to destabilization from time to time, the chairman of the Armenian Council of Ministers said:

[Begin Manukyan recording] You know, on the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan there are no contentious issues. That is, there is no reason—if we just take the border between Armenia and Azerbaijan—there is no reason for these two republics to organize clashes between themselves the whole time on the border, unless you take a third force. There are forces which want this, outside Azerbaijan and outside Armenia. In Armenia and Azerbaijan themselves, there are no contradictions over borders. Therefore one can suppose that, with the aid of talks between Azerbaijan and Armenia, these contradictions can be removed.

But there is one issue here that constantly gives rise to clashes on the border: the issue of Karabakh. If everything in Karabakh is calm, then no contradictions arise on the border. When some acute dilemma arises in Karabakh, then this gives rise to consternation among both peoples, and as these two peoples' meeting place is the border, clashes occur on the border. And so, in order that these acts should not occur, what is needed, first, is a precisely defined status for Karabakh, that is, for Karabakh to be an autonomous oblast lying inside Azerbaijan, and for there to be elected authority there, and for the people to enjoy all the liberties enjoyed in other autonomous formations in the Soviet Union. In that event things will be calm in Karabakh, and then, for calm on the border, it will be possible, with the aid of talks, to establish peace on the border, too. [end recording]

Armenian Representative Assails Moscow Actions

LD1205200491 Moscow TASS International Service in Russian 1910 GMT 12 May 91

[By TASS correspondent Ruben Shirinyans]

[Text] Moscow, 12 May (TASS)—Feliks Mamikonyan, Armenia's permanent representative in Moscow, addressed a news conference here today and levelled the accusation at the USSR central authorities that on their instructions "residents of the Armenian villages of Getashen and Martunashen in Azerbaijan have been deported."

Last Tuesday USSR Internal Affairs Minister Boris Pugo stated that forces of the USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs, the KGB and the Ministry of Defense, operating on the basis of the decree of the country's president dated 25 July last year, were taking measures to disarm illegal units in the zone of interethnic conflicts on the Armenian-Azerbaijani border.

In the opinion of Armenia's permanent representative, "in an effort to find a pretext for the deportation the minister announced that fighters had ensconced themselves in the Armenian villages; however, none were to be found there."

Feliks Mamikonyan also condemned the actions of the military in Armenian villages on the border with Azerbaijan. As a result of these actions, he announced, 24 people died, including 14 militia officers and 10 people from the countryside. The permanent representative expressed concern for the fate of people arrested during combat operations. Those present at the news conference were handed a list of these people. They include 60 members of staff at the Armenian Ministry of Internal Affairs and 31 civilians.

"There were no fighters in Armenian villages on the border with Azerbaijan either. This is indicated simply by the fact that the military confiscated only 160 combat weapons, consisting of standard issue weapons of Armenian militia officers and 40 hunting rifles," the permanent representative said.

Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic people's deputy Anatoliy Shabad, who has visited the Armenian village of Voskepar in the border area, where there was combat action, has stated that in the three days he spent in that village, he did not see a single fighter there.

Feliks Mamikonyan stressed that the solution to the Armenian-Azerbaijani conflict must be found using political means. For this the bodies of power that were abolished at the beginning of last year in connection with the introduction of the state of emergency must be restored in Nagorno-Karabakh. Their representatives must enter into talks with the Azerbaijani authorities. "Armenia does not lay claim to Nagorno-Karabakh [as received]. However, we must be confident that our fellow countrymen (over three-quarters of the population of the area are Armenians) are safe," said the permanent representative of Armenia in Moscow.

Mutalibov Receives Foreign Reporters

NC1005104991 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri 1700 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] Azerbaijan Republic President Ayaz Mutalibov received [name indistinct], director of the DAILY TELEGRAPH office in Moscow, and [name indistinct] a REUTER correspondent, in Baku on 8 May. The journalists are visiting Azerbaijan to gather reports on the situation in the Nagorno-Karabakh Autonomous Oblast and the border region between Azerbaijan and Armenia and on the measures that Azerbaijan has taken to restore peace in the republic. For four years armed Armenians and their uncontrolled activities have been making the people afraid.

All of the journalists' questions were answered in detail during the meeting. President Mutalibov stressed that the patience of the Azerbaijani people, who have been involved in the fighting caused by the Armenian separatists, has been exhausted. The leaders of the Union are now fulfilling their constitutional obligations toward the Azerbaijani people. They are seeing to it that the Azerbaijan Republic's sovereignty and territorial integrity are safeguarded.

The journalists thanked President Mutalibov for his detailed and sincere replies and promised that they will tell the truth about Azerbaijan to the world.

Central Asia

Kazakh TV: False Information May Be Distributed

LD0905221191 Alma-Ata Radio Network in Kazakh 1500 GMT 8 May 91

[Text] Several times during yesterday's news broadcast by Central Television, information was given on preparation of the draft law on Kazakh citizenship. It was stressed that only those who have lived on the territory of the republic for at least 10 years, who are willing to sign an oath of loyalty to the republic, and who have a command of the Kazakh language may be granted Kazakh citizenship.

It seems like someone is dissatisfied at Kazakhstan being a stable republic during the course of economic reforms and policy of strengthening interethnic relationships. The Kazakh SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasts stresses that the news broadcast by Central Television does not correspond to the facts, and is worried by the Postfaktum agency's dissemination of false statements.

Tajik President Moves To Create Economic Council

LD1105220391 Dushanbe Radio Dushnabe Network in Tajik 0005 GMT 11 May 91

[Text] Tajik President Kakhar Makhkamov has issued a decree on establishing an economic council within the Tajik Soviet Socialist Republic [SSR] Presidency. It says: To complete the management of republican economic reforms, to develop the principles of state regulation of the market economy as well as [word indistinct] restructuring of leadership in economic and social spheres on the basis of the principles of economic independence, the economic council should be established within the Tajik SSR Presidency. Composition of the council will be published in the press.

Tajik Government Reduces Local Retail Prices

LD1205125291 Moscow All-Union Radio First Program Radio-1 Network in Russian 1000 GMT 12 May 91

[Text] The Cabinet of Ministers [as heard] of Tajikistan has adopted a resolution to reduce retail prices on many locally produced goods by 5-50 percent. At the same time, to cover expenditure, it has been decided to raise retail prices of vodka, brandy, champagne, wine, and wine products by an average of 70 percent. The funds thus raised will be used to cover the budget deficit.

Kyrgyz's Akayev Appeals To Curb Strike Pressure

PM1305085791 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian 12 May 91 Union Edition p 1

[Aleksandr Ryabushkin report: "First Strike Committee Set Up in Kyrgyzstan"]

[Text] Bishkek—An appeal to labor collectives at industrial, transportation, and power generation enterprises in Kyrgyzstan adopted at a meeting between workers and President A. Akayev has been published.

Recently things have been uneasy at the usually calm plants and major associations of Bishkek. The republic's first strike committee has been set up at the M.V. Frunze Agricultural Machinery Plant, while workers have become more active at works meetings and meetings with the management, and whole collectives have issued demands at the computer plant, the V.I. Lenin Machine Building Plant, and other enterprises. People are dissatisfied about the price rises, their low pay, and the lack of work owing to shortfalls in deliveries of materials from neighboring regions.

The appeal from the workers, which states that the crisis can only be overcome through radical economic reform, democratic transformations, and in an atmosphere of civic peace and harmony, is aimed at reducing the tension in labor collectives.